



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 104th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 141

WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, DECEMBER 19, 1995

No. 204

House of Representatives

The House met at 9 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore [Mr. GUTKNECHT].

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,
December 19, 1995.

I hereby designate the Honorable GIL GUTKNECHT to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

NEWT GINGRICH,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

MORNING BUSINESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of May 12, 1995, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning hour debates. The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties, with each party limited to 25 minutes, and each Member, other than the majority or minority leader, limited to 5 minutes. But in no event shall debate continue beyond 9:50 a.m.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GOSS] for 5 minutes.

ELECTIONS IN HAITI

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, while we were at work here this past weekend trying to get out of the budget stalemate we are in, there were events going on in the world that are of very, very great importance to American interests.

In Russia, as you know, there are elections there. We are now sifting through and sorting out exactly what those elections meant.

Initially, though, not very much noticed at all, were other elections nearby in the small, tiny nation of Haiti,

just to our south, a friendly neighboring country. It is an election that Americans had a great stake in, primarily because we have invested on a per-capita basis probably more money in that election than any other in recent history. We have a huge American taxpayer dollar investment there in the growth of democracy, and I think it is very important that we have a full assessment of the way the moneys have been spent and how that tiny nation is doing on its path to democracy.

I think the important thing to say now is that the good news from Haiti is that there is no bad news; but the bad news is there is not much good news either.

Haiti did not have full, fair, free elections. But they did have a step in the right direction because they were able to carry out elections on a countrywide basis for a new President without any of the violence that we have seen in previous elections in that country.

The IRI [International Republic Institute] was there monitoring the progress of their elections, and they concluded in the conversations that I had in a telephone conversation with our on-the-ground team that what happened on Sunday in Haiti was important but it was not conclusive. So I think we are in a position now where we have got a pretty good assessment of the electoral process underway, the technical problems they had. What we do not have is a full assessment of what happened and where we are going now to justify the investment of taxpayer dollars and the American troops we have had there and what we should do next.

I think it is clear that we had low numbers in the Haitian election both in terms of candidates who are participating and in terms of voter turnout. The estimates in voter turnout are called light. The election was called lackluster, uninspiring. There are a lot of reasons for that.

It is true there are a lot of candidates who did not run, for a variety of reasons. Primarily the presidential campaign time was a very abbreviated time. It was about 4 weeks or so, and the campaign tactics themselves were nearly invisible. There was not a lot of campaigning, and there was not a lot of interest generated in the country as a result through the normal campaign tactics that you see for a presidential election.

The fact that much of the loyal opposition, including several of its major parties, boycotted the elections is not a good sign for democracy. People who feel compelled to go outside the system and will not participate inside the system and do not feel welcome or feel frustrated or feel it is so tilted they cannot have a fair chance clearly are making a statement when they say, "We are being forced outside the system."

It is also a fact that in Haiti, I think voter fatigue is a possibility. They have had a lot of elections, and I think that an awful lot of voters are saying the same things to reporters today they were saying to me after the parliamentary elections in June, and that is,

Why should we keep voting for this democracy thing? I still do not have a job. I am still hungry. My family is still hungry. I voted three times. Nothing is better. I am not sure democracy works. The only thing I know is Aristide is my hero.

And unfortunately, Aristide was not on the ballot because constitutionally he cannot succeed himself, and a lot of people probably stayed home because the person they wanted to vote for they could not vote for, so they registered their objection that way.

I think many others stayed home because the election was clearly, those who were organized were the one party that was ready for it and had all of the resources and the blessing apparently of the international parties, and they

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper containing 100% post consumer waste

H15089

just steamrolled it and apparently, when the election results come in, everybody believes widely there will be one very clear winner, not anybody really in second place. I do not know if that will be true. I think that is a feeling that probably kept people from voting.

In any event, when you have a countrywide presidential election that is supposed to be the most historic event in the peaceful turnover of democracy in the whole history of the country's 200 years and you only get somewhere between 20 and 30 percent turnout, clearly it is not working quite the way it should be.

Security was better. Law and order was better. Of course, it would be if you have Humvees with machine guns and soldiers mounted all over the place and running around from place to place insuring nothing gets out of hand. So we have somewhat of an artificial situation there about law and order.

Regrettably, as in every election, we had intimidations that kept candidates out. We had the media shut down through intimidations. We had allegations of misuse of dollars, all of those kinds of things. These things need a full accounting and full investigation.

Then the President needs to come to Congress and consult and tell Congress and the American people how we spent our money, what we have got for it, and where we are going next. I urge the President, Mr. Speaker, very much this time to consult with Congress before we get into the next chapter of what our relations are going to be with Haiti. I would hate to have to debate another invasion here, because we are seeing one more time a flood of refugees coming to the United States, and the administration's reaction is to send the military.

The economy does not work in Haiti. We know that. We need to have a full accounting. We need to know where we are going, and I urge the administration to check with the U.S. Congress. We are here to help.

NO BUDGET, NO PAY FOR MEMBERS OF CONGRESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DURBIN] is recognized during morning business for 5 minutes.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Speaker, last month the Federal Government was shut down by the gentleman from Georgia, Mr. GINGRICH, and Mr. DOLE for the longest period of time in our Nation's history. It cost American taxpayers \$100 million a day for this political strategy, a manufactured crisis that sent 800,000 Federal employees home.

Most people thought that the Republicans had learned their lesson. America was not ready for that kind of political strategy. They found it childish and unnecessary, and yet here we are today in the midst of another Govern-

ment shutdown, inspired and orchestrated by the same Republican leaders. They just do not get it. They do not understand that sending home some 300,000 Federal employees a few days before Christmas is beyond heartless, it is stupid, crazy for us as a Nation to be incurring debts of \$80 million to \$100 million a day because of someone's pride.

The American people sent Democrats and Republicans to Washington to solve problems, not to create them, not to say to people who are going to Federal agencies today that their phone calls will be unanswered and no one will be at the door. What they want us to do is to sit down in a commonsense, bipartisan way, deal with our budgetary problems, to make sure we protect Medicare and Medicaid, to make sure that we do not end up obliterating college student loan programs, and to bring a balanced budget in a reasonable period of time.

It is time for some of the political hubris to be set aside.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DURBIN. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. SCHUMER. I think the gentleman makes an excellent point. I mean, I think the American people know there are differences between us. We believe in saving the Medicare and Medicaid systems, with some moderate cuts. They believe in huge cuts and then tax cuts.

Mr. DURBIN. Let me just close by saying this: If it is a matter of principle to shut down the Government, as a matter of principle, the Speaker ought to give up his paycheck; no budget, no pay. If it applies to Federal employees, it ought to apply to the Speaker and every Member of Congress.

THE BUDGET IMPASSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. SCHIFF] is recognized during morning business for 5 minutes.

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Speaker, I have a different view of why we have reached this impasse today. I acknowledge that in the past, during the discussions about reaching a balanced budget, that both sides bear some responsibility for putting some unnecessary obstacles in the way of reaching that goal. I think that the Republicans, at the very beginning, tried to put in unnecessary non-budget-related issues that have since been removed.

I think the President tried to avoid agreeing to a 7-year timeframe even though when he was campaigning for President of the United States 3 years ago, he said he would propose a balanced budget in 5 years.

But even though the past responsibility falls on both political parties, I believe the current impasse we are in today falls squarely on the Clinton ad-

ministration, and that is simply because the President of the United States is attempting to back out of the agreement he entered into less than a month ago with the Congress of the United States. We resolved the last partial Government shutdown by coming to an agreement. There were several major terms in that agreement, and one of those terms was that we would use common economic projections to put together a balanced budget.

I know this sounds very technical, but economic projections are the building blocks of any budget. They are the forecasts, in this case over 7 years, of how much Government revenue will be received, how much there will be an inflationary impact on Government programs and so forth.

The agreement by the President of the United States and the Congress of the United States was that we would use the figures of the Congressional Budget Office. Now, there was an additional provision, that the Congressional Budget Office was expected to consult with outside sources, which, to the best of my knowledge, they have done. But the bottom line, without any doubt, is that a budget would be put together using only the economic projections of the Congressional Budget Office. The President of the United States now is attempting to avoid living up to an agreement with the Congress of the United States, and the President has stated, first of all, that the Congress is demanding that the President put some cuts in Medicare and Medicaid and other programs up before negotiations can continue. This is not correct.

The Congress is saying the President should put forward a budget based upon CBO, Congressional Budget Office, projections, and that is all. Within those budget projections, the President is free, the administration is free, to put together any budget they want. They can have tax cuts or not have tax cuts. They can have tax increases if they want to propose it. They can have more funding for any program, less funding for any other program. So there is absolutely nothing in putting together a budget based upon the Congressional Budget Office economic projections of revenue, inflation and so forth, that dictates in advance what a budget has to look like.

I heard one of my Democratic colleagues this morning on television say, "Well, the agreement was we will use the Congressional Budget Office as a baseline, but then we could look at other figures." That is not correct. The agreement was that we would use the Congressional Budget Office figures.

Now, the point is, Mr. Speaker, that that is exactly what the Congress of the United States has done. The Congress of the United States passed a budget. I do not agree with all of its individual terms. But the Congress of the United States passed a budget and sent to the President a budget that was balanced in 7 years, which was part of our

agreement and that used Congressional Budget Office figures as the building blocks, as the revenue projections, the inflationary effect and so forth.

The President vetoed this bill. That is the President's prerogative, not only constitutionally, under the Constitution of the United States, of course, but under the agreement which also said there would be adequate funding for certain programs and if the President felt that the increases that that budget included for Medicare and Medicaid were not sufficient, then the President could go ahead and veto.

But the Congress has then made a very reasonable requests: "Mr. President, if you feel that our budget does not adequately protect certain priorities, show us your budget under the exact same framework. Put forward a budget under the exact same framework. Put forward a budget that is balanced in 7 years and uses the Congressional Budget Office economic projections and is shown to be balanced in 7 years under the CBO numbers, and show us how exactly you would protect your priorities."

□ 0915

If you want to spend more on one program, what do you propose to spend differently, or how do you propose to have a different tax structure in order to pay for it? The point is that if the President of the United States is going to veto the congressional budget, which again is his privilege, he should then put out his budget on the same framework.

Further negotiations I think are impossible unless we are dealing with budgets that are put together under the same measuring yardstick, apples to apples if you will. Unless the President puts forward a budget under the same yardstick, there is no way we can compare, well, this is how we funded a certain program and this is how the President would fund the same program.

So, Mr. Speaker, I urge the President to comply with our agreement and come forth with a budget.

PEOPLE ARE BEHIND THE BUDGET FIGURES

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GUTKNECHT). Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KLINK] is recognized during morning business for 2 minutes.

Mr. KLINK. Mr. Speaker, there has been much name calling, there has been rhetoric, there has been invectiveness as we face the second Government shutdown of this year with really no end in sight, and as previous speakers have talked, the first one was the longest in the history of our Nation.

I think the President made a very valuable and very important point yesterday when he talked about the fact that there are people behind these figures. When you talk about cuts in Med-

icare and you talk about cuts in Medicaid, when you talk about adult children being held responsible for paying the nursing home bills for their parents, taking money out of the funds they would use to purchase a home, taking funds that they would use to send their children to college, we may be balancing the budget in the short run, but in the long run, our Nation will be much weaker. Those children of the adult children will be less educated.

I can remember back in the early 1980's when a Republican President named Ronald Reagan was pushing the same kind of idea, that somehow these massive tax cuts for wealthy individuals and wealthy corporations were going to trickle down and were going to help those of us that were on the lower side, those of us that were working individuals.

Let me tell you what happened in my area of southwestern Pennsylvania during that period of time. We lost in 13 counties 155,000 manufacturing jobs. No one ran away with those tax breaks. The rich corporations and the rich individuals did not reinvest that money in this country, and they are not going to do it now.

We are talking about taking money out of Medicare, taking money out of Medicaid, making adult children pay for the care that their working parents paid for with their tax dollars over the last 30 years, since 1965, when Medicare and Medicaid were passed in this House and were signed by President Johnson. They are taking that money and giving it away to the wealthy corporations of this Nation.

That is what it is about. It is about a transfer of wealth. It did not work in the 1980's, it blindsided our working people, and it is not going to work again in the 1990's, and President Clinton is very correct when he stands up and says that he will veto this.

Mr. Speaker, we have got to sit down and rebalance our priorities, not just balance our budget.

THE BUDGET IMPASSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FATTAH] is recognized during morning business for 2 minutes.

Mr. FATTAH. Mr. Speaker, good morning to my colleagues and good morning to America. It is clear now that we have a congressional majority that lacks the maturity to govern this Nation's budgetary processes. We have arrived again at an impasse in which the Congress has failed to pass a budget and the spending bills necessary in an acceptable enough form in which the President of the United States would sign them, which is the responsibility of the Congress.

It is perhaps a good thing that the President is attempting to work with congressional leaders to help them figure through a shared approach to the

budget, but it is the Congress' responsibility to pass a budget as outlined in the U.S. Constitution. We have arrived at a point today at which the seemingly clear set of circumstances lead us to believe that the House Republicans, NEWT GINGRICH and his colleagues, are the single stumbling block to us arriving at a budget agreement.

We have the President, we have Senate Republicans and Senate Democrats who want to find a way to get the country back on the right track. House Democrats are prepared to work. But we have House Republicans who seem to in a childish way want to hold fast to their own particular viewpoint of how the budget ought to work out, a viewpoint that the American public has soundly rejected in every single poll that has been done over the last few months.

They keep pushing something that no one else is buying. The American public says "We don't want to cut education, we don't want to cut Medicaid, we do not want to see these programs eradicated. What we want to see is a more responsible approach that would lead us away from tax cuts, lead us away from increasing defense spending when it is not necessary, when it is well over what the Pentagon has even recommended." The American public has said no to the Republican budget, but yet NEWT GINGRICH and the House Republicans keep wanting to sell us something that no one is buying. That is why we have arrived again at this shutdown.

Mr. Speaker, I would hope that as we face this new day here in the Congress, that some common sense would come to the majority, that they would stop acting in immature ways, because I think they really threaten their very majority in the ways they are acting now.

BALANCING THE BUDGET

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. NEUMANN] is recognized during morning business for 3 minutes.

Mr. NEUMANN. Mr. Speaker, the problem we are facing today is not a discussion between spending priorities. The problem we are facing today is that the President's budget leaves the Federal checkbook \$70 billion overdrawn. I have a chart with me that shows me where we were last week in terms of deficits. This bottom line is where the deficits were over the last week.

You will notice in the year 2002, all of last week we had a Presidential proposal that left us \$115 billion overdrawn. On Friday of last week, the President brought us a new proposal. Here is what it did. It took the \$115 billion deficit and it reduced it to a point where it was a \$70 billion deficit. The problem with this is that it is still \$70 billion out of whack in the 7th year.

Let me make this as clear as I can possibly make it. The proposal that we

have from the President today does not, I repeat, does not, balance the budget in 7 years. That makes it unacceptable.

Let me put this another way. In the 7th year of the President's proposal, he proposes that we spend \$106 billion more of the taxpayers' money and he proposes that we collect \$36 billion more from the taxpayers of this country. So he proposes that we spend \$106 billion more in the 7th year, and he proposes we collect \$36 billion more in taxes. That leaves us \$70 billion over in the 7th year.

Let me just finish, because this gets much better. The Republican plan that is currently on the table, the Republican plan on the table today, proposes that we spend \$11.948 trillion of the American people's money. That is to say, \$46,000 over the next 7 years for every man, woman and child in the United States of America, \$46,000 per person. The President wants to spend \$400 billion more than that.

I have a problem with that, because back in my district, they think \$46,000 a person is enough spending.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NEUMANN. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman's courtesy. I would just note that the CBO numbers show that the Republican budget, the deficit goes back up in the years 2003, 2004, and 2005. Would the gentleman be willing, if I might finish, given his passion for balancing the budget, which I respect, to say if that happens, we should reduce some of the deep tax cuts in that budget so that we can balance the budget?

Mr. NEUMANN. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, it is very important to look very seriously at the budget proposal we put out of our office earlier this year. We put forth a plan that balanced the budget, we had 5 years, but, OK, let us do it in 7 years as we have all agreed to in this House. After the 7th year, we would allow spending to increase at a rate 1 percent slower than the rate of new growth.

We need to go back to the plan as proposed in our budget proposal out of my office earlier this year, because what that will do is require that we start building a surplus so we can start paying down this debt, so we can give this Nation to our children without this huge debt. When you start talking beyond 7 years, the reality is we do not have much of an opportunity to work out those numbers.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. NEUMANN] has expired.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman be allowed to proceed for one additional minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair would advise Members that the time has been allocated.

MEANS OF CALCULATING BUDGET NUMBERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DOGGETT] is recognized during morning business for 2 minutes.

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, I guess the question I have this morning is when will our Republican friends propose a balanced budget? Yes, that is right, when will they propose a budget that is in true balance?

You see, they think that a balanced budget can be balanced using a calculator; that is the only tool that you need to see whether the numbers add up, whether you can add, subtract, divide, and multiply them. But a budget is more than a collection of numbers. It is a statement of a country's priorities, and not everything in that budget can be measured with mathematical accuracy.

How do you measure in mathematics what it costs to deny one young child the opportunity to participate in Head Start, to get all the education that he or she needs in order to be a productive member of this society and share in the American dream?

How do you measure with a calculator what it means to a family to be ripped asunder when suddenly they have the burden of having to care for a senior who has to be placed in a nursing home, and, under this Republican plan, you reach down and dip into the resources of the middle-class family that is already struggling to make ends meet to pay for that senior who has to be provided nursing home care?

How do you measure with mathematical accuracy the burden on the senior who has to choose between health care and being able to eat?

Those are the questions that have to be raised when you look at balancing the budget. Yes, it is an important objective to be sure the mathematics balance, but it is critical that any balanced budget have true balance. And that is what this is all about, because our Republican friends think as long as you take from those who are on Medicare and give to those corporations more tax breaks, do not ask the corporations to sacrifice, do not ask the wealthy to sacrifice, just ask the young children, just ask those who want clean air and clean water, just ask our seniors to sacrifice, put all the burden on one side, that is not a balanced budget.

I say it is time for our Republican friends to come forward with the first balanced budget, because all the ones they have given us up to now may add up in the numbers, but they do not add up when it comes to the future of America.

FACTS ON THE BALANCED BUDGET

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of May

12, 1995, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. EWING] is recognized during morning business for 3 minutes.

Mr. EWING. Mr. Speaker, I come here today to talk about the balanced budget and to talk about some things that may be educational to people who watch this.

First of all, I think the attacks on the majority fail to recognize the total picture. If you follow the rhetoric that you hear in attacking the Republican majority in their effort to balance the budget, if you follow their line of reasoning, we could never balance the budget so long as there was one individual out there who may not be served to the same extent that some think they should.

You ask the American people how they feel on these different issues, and we all know that it depends on how you ask the question. But the one thing that we are aware of and that has come through loud and clear is that when you ask the question "should we balance the budget," the American people say yes.

Yes, we will have to make choices. Yes, we will have to rearrange how we do business. Otherwise, some day the house of cards will come tumbling down.

It has been 30 years almost since the Federal budget was balanced, and the new Republican Congress has the opportunity to make this happen, with some support from the minority side. They say they want a balanced budget. Let us see some support from them to get that done. Or, if we fail, I think the American people will say "business as usual." We will not revisit any of the hard decisions between now and the next two decades if we fail this time.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, there is an article in the morning paper which I think was very interesting and might be very interesting to all of us and to the viewers at home. There are two categories of Government spending. One, where we purchase things for use by Government; and the other is transfer payments, and that is where we take from the middle-class family and transfer it, transfer it to somebody else, because they are not working or do not work or cannot work. And you have to address that problem, because it is now almost 20 percent of the Federal income that goes to transfer payments, and it is growing at an enormous rate.

So the discussion about the budget just is not crunching a few numbers and the President giving here and the Congress giving there. It is about how we do government and how we spend the money.

□ 0930

REPUBLICANS SHUT DOWN GOVERNMENT BECAUSE THEY CANNOT GET THEIR OWN WAY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of May

12, 1995, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PALLONE] is recognized during morning business for 2 minutes.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I wanted to follow up on what my colleague from the other side, from Wisconsin, said before. He talked about differences over the budget and the numbers over the budget, but the problem is that while we are arguing over these budget differences, whether it is the numbers or the priorities, the Government should remain open.

It is the Republicans, it is Speaker GINGRICH who wants to shut the Government down because he cannot get his way in terms of what he thinks the budget should be all about. That is not fair. That is the reason the Government was shut down 2 weeks ago, because Speaker GINGRICH and the Republican leadership did not get their own way.

Now, everyone knows that the majority in this House and in the Senate is the only body or the only group that can bring up a continuing resolution to keep up. The Speaker, last Friday, the Speaker yesterday, and so far I have heard nothing today about bringing up a continuing resolution so that this Government can continue to operate. That is what is causing the crisis. That is what is making everyone around the country so aggravated.

That is the reason, I believe also, why we had the problem with the stock market yesterday, because while we are discussing and negotiating this budget, the Government should not be shut down. The Republicans should not make this into a crisis situation by shutting down the Government.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we have major differences over the priorities here. We have differences over the numbers, we have differences over the priorities. The Democrats have been saying all along that Medicare must be preserved, Medicaid must be preserved, that the Republicans are giving huge tax breaks primarily to wealthy Americans and to corporations and that money for those tax breaks should be put back into the budget so that Medicare and Medicaid, the environment and education programs remain solvent. That is what I think the goal should be.

The President has been articulating all weekend the fact that he cannot accept the Republican priorities because he feels very strongly, and he is right, that Medicare, Medicaid, the environment and education must be preserved. So far the Republican leadership has not come up with anything, not put anything on the table that would preserve those priorities, and, in the meantime, they tell us all we are going to shut the Government down because we do not get our own way.

FEDERAL EMPLOYEES ARE INNOCENT VICTIMS IN GOVERNMENT SHUTDOWN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of May

12, 1995, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. DAVIS] is recognized during morning business for 3 minutes.

Mr. DAVIS. Ms. Speaker, I have lost my voice but I have not lost my will here.

Quite frankly, if the President had signed some of the appropriations bills on his desk last week, we could have kept the park system open and a number of other agencies. I think he was saying my way or no way. I think both sides need to get together and keep talking.

What bothers me about this is that a month ago the President signed a resolution saying a balanced budget, 7 years, CBO numbers, and a month later he has not submitted any plan that does that. Hopefully, he will put that on the table, we can get both sides to pass a continuing resolution, and we can move ahead at that point and negotiate out the differences. And there are honest and sincere differences, but we need to move ahead. The American people are relying on us to do this. Certainly the markets are at this point.

I wanted to bring up something else today, and that is the innocent victims of this whole thing, and that is the Federal employees. Federal workers today have been undergoing a lot of stress. They have been undergoing downsizing efforts by both the administration and this Congress. Benefit cuts. Many have been proposed that have not gone into effect, but some have in the agreements that have gone through as well. So they are undergoing downsizing, benefit cuts and now furloughs at Christmas time.

The tragedy for these workers, who we are asking everyday to do more with less, is they cannot even, under Federal law, go get a second job. They cannot even work as a store department Santa Claus under Federal rules. So we furlough them, we do not let them have another job, and now we have Members saying, well, we cannot pay these people because they are not working. But they want to work, they want to be out doing the job that we have asked them to do, but the Federal law does not allow them.

These people will miss their Christmas paychecks. And to suggest that they should not be paid, when it is no fault of their own and they are unintended victims of this, is outrageous.

We have to recognize that if Government wants to attract the best and the brightest, and maintain these people in our Federal work force, so they can get the job done as we cut the budgets and ask people to do more with less, we have to bring their morale around and we have to incentivize them to do that, and we are not acting in a way to do this. If we were a private company and were undergoing downsizing, with the stress that we have, we would never threaten our employees as we have done in this particular case.

Of course, they should be paid, when this is all over and the resolution is done. It has happened every time be-

fore. For Members to suggest otherwise, and who say, well, it looks stupid to pay people for not working, it is not their fault they are not working. They want to be there. The only reason they are not is because we have not reached agreement with the President of the United States.

We will never get good people to come back into Government to serve the Government. As President Kennedy said, ask not what your country can do for you, ask what you can do for your country. We will never get that spirit when we start treating workers in this shabby a manner.

I would hope the President will put a balanced budget on the table, as he promised a month ago. It will not meet the priorities of the Members of my side, but we can pass a continuing resolution, work out our differences, get these people back to work, let them perform the functions of Government and give the American people a Christmas present of a balanced budget.

GOVERNMENT SHUTDOWN IS TO AID IN DISMANTLEMENT OF MEDICARE AND TO CUT AND REPEAL MEDICAID

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BONIOR] is recognized during morning business for 5 minutes.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, I will not take the full time, but I wanted to come to the floor this morning to echo the message that some of my colleagues have been giving, and that is basically this: The Speaker of the House, Speaker GINGRICH, has closed down the Government again for the second time, and in order to do two things: To dismantle Medicare and to cut and repeal Medicaid.

My colleagues do not have to take my word for it. I want to refer my colleagues to two reports; one that was issued by the Consumer Union. This is a group of people that puts out a publication called the Consumer Report. America knows about the Consumer Report. It is a publication that one goes to when one wants to buy a car or one wants to buy a television set. It has enormous credibility. Listen to what they say.

"What Congress isn't telling you: Families of nursing home residents may face financial ruin under Federal Medicaid bill."

They estimate that 395,000 long-term care patients are likely to lose Medicaid payments for their nursing home care next year if this Republican repeal of Medicaid goes through. They go on to talk about some of the effects of this proposal by the Republicans.

If someone is in a nursing home in the family, it costs about \$38,000 a year. That is more than most families in America make today. And they go on to point out, in this report, that adult children may be held financially liable for nursing home bills of their

parents. Family assets, including homes, may be sold or seized to pay nursing home bills. No one is guaranteed Medicaid nursing home eligibility as they are now. Families may be forced to spend their life savings for long-term care of a loved one. And on and on and on.

That was a report that was issued last November. A report issued in December, just recently, by the National Citizens' Coalition for Nursing Home Reform says this about the repeal of Medicaid. "The report analyzed nursing home laws in 10 States and found none of the current State laws meet the minimum standards found necessary in 1987 to protect nursing home residents."

"This proposal moves us back in time to the nursing home dark ages when residents were tied and drugged, lying in their own waste, ignored by untrained, overworked staff."

So what is going on here, basically, ladies and gentlemen, is that Mr. GINGRICH, the Speaker of the House, has closed down the Government for the second time in order for him to continue with his Republican colleagues to dismantle Medicare, a program that we have had, we have enjoyed now since 1964. It has protected literally tens of millions of people in this country from economic devastation, and he goes on to take after Medicaid, which protects children, a quarter of the children in America who get their health care from Medicaid.

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, I said I would not yield, and I would ask the Speaker to enforce my right to speak on the floor without being interrupted.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GUTKNECHT). The gentleman from Michigan controls the time.

Mr. BONIOR. The Speaker goes on to take on the disabled, our elderly in this country, and children, a quarter of which, as I indicated, get their health care from Medicaid.

These assaults on middle income people, on the elderly, on disabled, and on children in this country are what we are trying to protect. We will not be blackmailed by Speaker GINGRICH by shutting down this Government to go after these people. They deserve the support and the help of every Member of this institution, and we will not be blackmailed by the dismantling of Medicare and by the repeal of Medicaid in order for our seniors, as these two reports issued in November and December, in order for our seniors to have this type of activity with respect to their long-term care perpetrated upon them.

So we say to our friends on this side of the aisle, stop this nonsense, stop these games that we are playing. Let us get this Government back to work and let us get on with dealing with the real question at hand, and that is a balanced budget that protects Medicare, that protects Medicaid, that protects

education, and that protects our environment. That is what we need to do.

We have dealt with the issue of 7 years. We have dealt with the CBO issue, but the majority has done nothing, nothing to live up to the standards that were set in the last CR with respect to the issues of Medicaid, Medicare, education, and the environment. There has been no movement at all on the Republican side on those issues.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BONIOR. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman for raising this point because when we look at the Medicaid Program, and we see an ad here that is signed by corporate leaders, who have laid off tens of thousands of Americans, and the children in many cases of low-paid workers, those children of those workers have lost their health insurance.

Three million children are without health insurance. And what the Speaker is saying is we have to dismantle Medicaid rather than give those children health care coverage.

BUDGET MUST BE MATHEMATICALLY BALANCED

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. SOUDER] is recognized during morning business for 3 minutes.

Mr. SOUDER. Mr. Speaker, it is tough during this time of year, when we should be home with our families and celebrating the birth of our Savior and having the time of a wonderful holiday season, to be pinned down here with this acrimony. And I know many Americans throughout the country are fed up, but we are at a real crossroads.

It is especially cruel, I believe, to be putting out the false information and scaring the most vulnerable in our society, the senior citizens, who do not have a lot of their life to look forward to in many ways, and yet when they hear this type of thing, to be scared with the false information that is out is especially disturbing and especially cruel at this time of year.

I also heard an earlier speaker say that we should not just mathematically balance the budget. My question is what will we do, emotionally balance the budget, rhetorically balance the budget, demagogically balance the budget? Of course, we have to mathematically balance the budget. Every American in this country has to mathematically balance their budgets.

I guess there is a real difference between the two sides. They believe in Santa Claus and we do not. We have to mathematically balance the budget. That is why we are sent to Congress; \$12 trillion is enough over the next 7 years. We are not cutting the budget. The previous 7 years was \$7 trillion. That is, in any terms, real growth. The

question here is how far is the Government going to grow, how big is the Government going to be?

For example, one of the other negotiations we are having with this President is he has been told, in effect, and I think most Americans can relate to this, that this bank account has been overdrawn for years and by big amounts. An average American, if they were told their bank account was overdrawn \$20,000 would work with the bank immediately to try to address that. We have compromised and said, OK, we will do this over 7 years to balance it. He refuses to come back with a proposal to actually balance it. He basically wants to go, OK, how about if we just leave it overdrawn by \$10,000? OK, how about if we just leave it overdrawn by 8,000?

The fact is we cannot have negotiations unless both sides agree on the fundamental principle that the budget has to be balanced, and the President has not put a proposal on the table that balances the budget. Once he puts a proposal to balance the budget on the table, then we can get into real discussions about how we will prioritize that spending. And that is a legitimate thing for the American people to expect, that we would have such a discussion as to how to prioritize that spending. But it is also legitimate they expect to have a budget on the table.

The stock market is not collapsing because of a CR, the stock market is worried we will not balance the budget. As Allan Greenspan has already said, they have factored in that we were going to balance the budget. Now they are afraid. They see the President going back on the agreement that we made, and there is a real concern in this country that we might be so gridlocked, that one party is not committed and our President is not indeed committed in spite of the rhetoric to a balanced budget.

The reason people cannot get into our national parks is he will not sign the appropriations bills. It has been nice to hear for months that we do not have the appropriations bills done, but basically, there are three over there now to be signed. Hopefully, another one will move.

I want to conclude by saying I realize that most Americans would be a little shocked, but it is time for the President to keep his word and put a budget on the table.

□ 0945

SPEAKER SHOULD ALLOW GOVERNMENT TO OPERATE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. GEJDENSON] is recognized during morning business for 5 minutes.

Mr. GEJDENSON. Mr. Speaker, what is clear here, but somewhat secretive in this town, is that of the participants in this battle, all but the Speaker are

ready to open the Government again. Frankly, all but the Speaker would have kept the Government open.

The President and Mr. DOLE and Mr. DOMENICI could have kept this government open, but what happened? First, the Speaker got a bad seat on an airplane, and so he shut the Government down. Now, he has gotten bad poll numbers and he figures he cannot rebuild himself, so he is going to tear the whole Government down, hoping to bring everybody down with him.

We are one country trying to resolve some issues and it seems clear to me that the way to resolve these issues is not to set out to put our citizens in harm's way, put our Federal workers in harm's way, and disgrace this country by an inability to keep this Government working.

When we were first elected in 1980, we had grave differences with Ronald Reagan. But we had Democratic Speakers who gave the President every courtesy, who then proceeded to work with President Reagan to make sure the Government kept working, even where we had grave disagreements.

But not this Speaker. This Speaker refuses, of all the leaders here, he refuses to keep this Government operating. It seems clear to me that if he was a military leader, he would start bombing his own cities as a demonstration of strength. What we need to do is get back to work.

Mr. Speaker, I will be happy to yield to the gentlewoman from Texas [Ms. JACKSON-LEE].

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the words of the gentleman from Connecticut, because I rise this morning to ask if we could simply tell the truth. I think if we put the truth on the table, we might get going.

The continuing resolution, and I think the gentleman from Connecticut was here that weekend of the 19th, insisting that we worked to ensure that the Government not shut down. I think it is important to remind the American people that the President is not standing on weak ground.

I would caution my colleagues on the other side of the aisle about believing in Santa Claus. There are millions of children around this world and in this country that we hope will hold a vision of hope and we hope they will believe in Santa Claus. But the President and the Congress signed onto a continuing resolution that indicated that we would provide adequate funding for Medicaid, education, Medicare solvency, agriculture, national defense, and the environment and to ensure the protection of generations of people.

This morning, I spoke to my 10-year-old and this is in tribute to Jason, because I am not there with him for his Christmas program. We all believe in moving this country forward. But the American people are seeing, first of all, their Government shut down with innocent, hard-working Federal employees out on the streets, hindering their

opportunity to provide for their families. But more importantly, all of the services that they provide are no longer here for the American people.

This side is standing for the American people. I believe those who say they do not believe in Santa Claus are just about bringing Scrooge to the national forum. What we should be doing is coming together and working, telling the truth so that I can go home and tell the mother who has a young child with a brain tumor, and a mother who has another child with respiratory problems, and another child with a heart condition, and who is a single parent on welfare and needs Medicaid, that she is an American too and that we are trying to help her bridge out of this condition into independence.

Mr. Speaker, I think we need to stand on the side of the American people, tell the truth, and to make sure that we provide an opportunity for a fair, balanced budget, not on the backs of those who are most needy.

Mr. GEJDENSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. MORAN].

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman mentioned President Reagan, and think it is important to bear in mind that when we had a budget conflict in 1987 and 1988, between a Republican President and a Democratic Congress, what we did was to pass a continuing resolution that lasted all year long; a clean continuing resolution. But Federal employees were not made pawns in that process. There is no reason why Federal employees should be furloughed today.

Yesterday, in a press conference, Speaker GINGRICH indicated that those Federal employees may not even be paid at Christmas time. How unbelievable could this situation be that we would have families with children who are working for the American people, laid off, put on furlough just before Christmas, and told they may not even be paid during Christmas?

But it is believable. We just fired 11 people that served this House in the well of the House, doing necessary work. They had built up compensatory time, because they worked late at night. But because we will have the same laws that apply to the private sector apply to us January 1, we fired them just before Christmas time so we would not have to compensate them. Talk about mean spiritedness.

DEMOCRATS SHOULD PRESENT A 7-DAY BUDGET PLAN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentleman from Maine [Mr. LONGLEY] is recognized during morning business for 5 minutes.

Mr. LONGLEY. Mr. Speaker, I had a chance to talk to my daughter, Sarah, this morning, who was very proud that tomorrow morning she is going to be in a Christmas play. She was very concerned as to whether I was going to be able to make it or not.

In very simple English, I told her that unfortunately I could not, but that the reason I was not going to be there was that I had to be here because there were some people who wanted to spend her money, money that she was going to have to pay back, and she did not think that was a good idea.

Mr. Speaker, I have got a challenge for the other side of the aisle. Our agreement of 30 days ago said, yes, we are going to ensure Medicare solvency, Medicaid, education, veterans, and the environment, all of the nice programs, all of the programs that we support. Well, I ask my Democrat colleagues to put their money where their mouth is. Tell us that they would spend. Give us a budget that reflects their priorities and stand up like men and women of integrity, not just mouthing off about the fact that they are in favor of this or in favor of that. Give us a legitimate 7-year budget. Tell us where they stand, so we can compare our plans with theirs.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the previous order of the House of January 4, 1995, morning hour debate may not continue beyond 9:50 a.m. today. Pursuant to clause 12, rule I, the House will stand in recess until 10 a.m.

Accordingly (at 9 o'clock and 50 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess until 10 a.m.

□ 1000

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker at 10 a.m.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Rev. James David Ford, D.D., offered the following prayer:

We are grateful, O God, that You have given to us the goals of justice and the designs of freedom. Remind us this day, gracious God, that it is our work to develop the strategies and the plans of achieving those goals being aware of the prodding of Your spirit. We know that You have given to each of us the abilities to do good works so we pray that we will be faithful in our tasks, responsible in our actions, and fervent in our desire to serve. We pray this together with the petitions of our own hearts. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House this approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. KINGSTON] will lead the

membership in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. KINGSTON led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledged allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Lundregan, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 395. An act to designate the United States courthouse and Federal building to be constructed at the southeastern corner of Liberty and South Virginia Streets in Reno, Nevada, as the "Bruce R. Thompson United States Courthouse and Federal Building."

The message also announced that the Senate had passed a joint resolution of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S.J. Res. 38. Joint resolution granting the consent of Congress to the Vermont-New Hampshire Interstate Public Water Supply Compact.

PRIVATE CALENDAR

The SPEAKER. This is Private Calendar day.

The Clerk will call the first individual bill on the Private Calendar.

ARTHUR J. CARRON, JR

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 418) for the relief of Arthur J. Carron, Jr.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

H.R. 418

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. WAIVER OF TIME LIMITATIONS.

The time limitations set forth in section 3702(b) of title 31, United States Code, shall not apply with respect to a claim by Arthur J. Carron, Jr., of Bark River, Michigan, for amounts due to him by the Department of the Navy. The amounts due are represented by the following checks that were received but not negotiated by Arthur J. Carron, Jr.:

(1) Treasury check number 2,831,843, dated October 18, 1966, in the amount of \$10,850.74 for salary and expenses.

(2) Treasury check number 10,445,856, dated January 29, 1971, in the amount of \$1,361.00 for salary and expenses.

(3) Treasury check number 71,681,041, dated April 1, 1971, in the amount of \$562.25 for retirement pay.

SEC. 2. DEADLINE.

Section 1 shall apply only if Arthur J. Carron, Jr., or his authorized representative, submits a claim pursuant to such section before the expiration of the 3-month period beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

BENCHMARK RAIL GROUP, INC.

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 419) for the relief of Benchmark Rail Group, Inc.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

H.R. 419

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. FINDING AND PURPOSE.

(a) FINDING.—The Congress finds that Benchmark Rail Group, Inc., of St. Louis, Missouri, satisfactorily performed emergency work after the Northridge earthquake, but has not been reimbursed as a result of a technicality under California State law.

(b) PURPOSE.—The purpose of this Act is to fairly compensate Benchmark Rail Group, Inc., for the work for which, except for the technicality under California State law, it would otherwise have been paid under the provisions of the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5121).

SEC. 2. PAYMENT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 30 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the director of the Federal Emergency Management Agency shall pay to Benchmark Rail Group, Inc., of St. Louis, Missouri, an amount equal to the total amount owed to Benchmark Rail Group, Inc., by the Federal Emergency Management Agency and the State of California to compensate Benchmark Rail Group, Inc., for the emergency work and services performed at the request of the Southern California Regional Rail Authority to the extent that such work and services are otherwise eligible for reimbursement under the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5121). The payment shall be made from funds appropriated to implement such Act.

(b) DEOBLIGATION OF FUNDS.—The Federal Emergency Management Agency shall deobligate an equal amount to that obligated previously for payment to the State of California to cover the costs of work performed for the Southern California Regional Rail Authority by Benchmark Rail Group, Inc., after the Northridge earthquake which would have been eligible for reimbursement under such Act.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

KRIS MURTY

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1315) for the relief of Kris Murty.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

H.R. 1315

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. RELOCATION EXPENSES FOR KRIS MURTY.

For the purpose of receiving reimbursement for relocation expenses under sections 5724 and 5724a of title 5, United States Code, Kris Murty of El Paso, Texas, an employee of the Department of the Army, is deemed to have been an employee transferred by the Department of the Army from one official station to another for permanent duty when he relocated from Houston, Texas, to Fort Bliss, Texas, in February 1985.

SEC. 2. LIMITATION ON AGENTS AND ATTORNEYS FEES.

No amount exceeding 10 percent of a payment made pursuant to section 1 may be paid to or received by any agent or attorney in consideration for services rendered in connection with the payment. Any person who

violates the provisions of this section shall be guilty of an infraction and shall be subject to a fine in the amount provided under title 18, United States Code.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This concludes the call of the Private Calendar.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

The SPEAKER. The Chair will recognize 20 1-minutes on each side.

LET OUR PEOPLE GO

(Mrs. MORELLA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mrs. MORELLA. Mr. Speaker, let our people go, let them go back to work.

Yesterday, we passed a budget resolution saying we would balance the budget in 7 years using CBO figures. Let us do it.

I would like to, during this third day of Hanukkah, with 6 days before Christmas, point out there is a face to this shutdown of Government, this partial shutdown. Yes, it affects 260,000 Federal employees and their families who are victims. Yes, it affects the private sector, those who have contracts. yes, it affects the financial market.

But I would like you to know, as I was driving in this morning I saw two cars in the driveway, two doors over, people who are usually gone at 7 o'clock in the morning, and that is because one of them works at Health and Human Services and one works at Commerce. They have four children. They have two children who are currently in college, and they are hit by the facts that we have not come up with a balanced budget.

I would also like to reflect the fact about a pharmacist at NIH, the human face is something we have got to realize and get on with our job.

BRING UP A CONTINUING RESOLUTION

(Mr. PALLONE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I am a little weighted down today, as you can see, but I just wanted to point out that, and this is following up on what the gentlewoman from Maryland just said, that the reason that the Federal Government is shut down today is because the Republican majority has not brought up a continuing resolution to let the Government continue to operate.

On Friday they did not bring one up. Yesterday they did not bring one up. Today again I have heard no talk of bringing it up.

I think it is simply not fair to keep the Government shut down while we

will discuss the budget. We should simply negotiate the budget. We have our differences, and they can be brought out and they can be negotiated. But in the interim, the Republican majority has an obligation to bring a continuing resolution to the floor and let the Government continue to operate, and I know that Frank also believes in that and so does Rose Marie.

BALANCING OUR FEDERAL BUDGET FOR OUR CHILDREN

(Mr. HAYWORTH asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I so happy my good friend from New Jersey brought his children to the floor of this body, because I think it demonstrates, it demonstrates so clearly why we have to work out these problems.

Because you see, as desirable in one sense as a continuing resolution might be to some, to the country, to the financial markets, that is just a continuation of the same old tax-and-spend mantra. In fact, the child that my colleague from New Jersey had in his arms, his son, if we do nothing to change the course of action that we are on, that little boy will pay over \$185,000 in taxes just on the national debt.

So it is precisely for those children and the children of Federal workers and all children in America and, indeed, all generations, that we work now to put aside partisan differences and balance our Federal budget.

Our children, our country, deserve no less.

BUDGET MUST REFLECT PRIORITIES OF THE AMERICAN PUBLIC

(Ms. DELAURO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, if we pass the Republican budget, the children of the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PALLONE] will have the air that they breathe fouled, the water they drink dirty, we will deny them their opportunity for student loans to be able to get an education.

This Republican budget does exactly what it says it does, and it denies children opportunity, if you take a look at it, chapter and verse, and you look at the fine print.

Last month, Mr. Speaker, Speaker GINGRICH shut down the Government because he did not like his seat on Air Force One. Now, he is at it again. What was it this time that caused the Speaker's tantrum? Who knows? Perhaps he was invited to breakfast at the White House and President Clinton got two slices of bacon while Speaker GINGRICH only got one.

What we do know is the American people have rejected Speaker GINGRICH's budget, a budget which would devastate Medicare, Medicaid, and edu-

cation, to finance a tax cut for the wealthy. Instead of listening to the American people, the Speaker chooses to shut down the Government to get his way. That is not leadership. It is childish.

The Speaker should have a budget that reflects the priorities of the American public, not his own.

SANTA DOES NOT LIVE IN WASHINGTON, DC

(Mr. CHABOT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CHABOT. Mr. Speaker, politicians in this town have dressed up as Santa Claus, popped down the chimney and robbed American families blind. On, sure, they have given gifts to their special-interest friends, but they have used the American people's credit card to do it, and all they have left our kids is a debt so huge that every single child born this year inherits a bill for \$187,000 just to pay the interest, just the interest, on the national debt.

These fake Santas, Mr. Speaker, take more than our milk and cookies. They gorge themselves on everything they can get their hands on, and then they claim that American families do not really need their taxes cut.

But the fact of the matter is that these fake Santas are eating the average family out of house and home. We have to slow the growth of wasteful Government spending, Mr. Speaker. We have to cut taxes. We have to cut the waste.

Mr. Speaker, the American people deserve no less. It is time to remember that Santa Claus does not live in Washington, DC.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BUNN of Oregon). The Chair reminds Members when they are addressing the House not to be accompanied by others who are not Members.

LUCRATIVE NEW BUSINESS: BODY BROKERING

(Mr. TRAFICANT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, the stock market fell 101 points, 2 percent of its total value. Everybody is making a lot of excuses.

The truth of the matter is America has become a paper tiger. Check this out: One of the most lucrative new businesses in America is body brokering. That is right, selling cadavers, dead bodies, for up to \$1,500.

Think about it, it is getting to the point the only way to make a living in America is over someone's dead body.

But if you are not surprised about that, what is the big surprise, folks?

When an American needs a Ph.D. just to figure out the first page of the tax code, you know something is screwed up. I wonder how the Labor Department is going to classify this new profession: Human resource procurement specialist? I guarantee there will be five or six jobs that will be assigned as definitions to body brokering jobs.

Beam me up, Mr. Speaker.

□ 1015

U.S. ECONOMY AT STAKE IN BUDGET BATTLE

(Mr. SMITH of Michigan asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, a minute is not very long. I will try. The budget economic ills clobber the market. The four chaps that came down 2 months ago, I talked to on the phone, they are saying here is what the market is thinking, that they are afraid we are not going to achieve a balanced budget. Therefore, the market is going down, largest drop in 4 years. We have seen interest rates go up. That has got to be a signal to use. We have got to pay attention.

In the Washington Post today, Jim Glassman writes, "As long as the President can pose as the saviour of Medicare, with the public blaming Congress for Government shutdowns, he is not going to negotiate seriously." Why should he?

Here is the bottom line of my message. Democrats, give me your ear: Everybody in this Chamber, or most everybody, wants a better America, better place to live and work. How are we going to come to grips with our overpromises and our overspending if we cannot keep borrowing the money simply to pay our bills? Let us get together. Let us do it. The market is at stake. The U.S. economy is at stake.

NOW WE MUST DECIDE ON SPENDING PRIORITIES

(Mr. DOYLE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, I was in my district this weekend and I spoke with many people throughout western Pennsylvania who are upset with the budget impasse here in Washington. One of my constituents, Joe Palumbo, put it to me quite simply when he said—"MIKE, why can't Republicans and Democrats, stop bickering and sit down together and work out their differences."

It's a good question. Yesterday over 350 members of this House agreed to balance the budget in 7 years using the latest CBO economic assumptions. We agree on balancing the budget, now we have to decide on spending priorities. Let me ask three things of my colleagues, both Democrat and Republican as an early Christmas present.

First, let us tone down our rhetoric and listen to each other as well as talk.

Second, let us respect each others concerns over tax cuts, Medicare, education, and other items as valid.

And finally, let us not miss this historic opportunity to reach a compromise that will balance our budget in a fair and equitable way.

Americans are counting on us.

WE NEED A BALANCED BUDGET NOW

(Mr. JONES asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. JONES. Mr. Speaker, we are in the middle of the most important debate in decades—do we balance the budget or do we allow the out of control spending to continue. If we do not balance the budget now, it will never happen.

We have worked for months on developing a plan that would protect future generations and the country's fiscal solvency. Our balanced budget offers the American people a dividend.

Just a month ago, President Clinton agreed to work with us to achieve a balanced budget using CBO numbers. However, once again the President has back peddled playing politics as usual. He is more concerned with power and spending taxpayer money than he is about our children's future. We have offered a reasonable, responsible balanced budget which benefits the American people.

President Clinton, it is time for to put the political games aside and start working on behalf of the American people.

LET US AGREE ON A BALANCED BUDGET

(Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, this is a tragically historic time, because the Republicans for the first time in history have shut down the United States Government two times in 1 year. There are faces to this shutdown. As I listen to the cries in my district in Houston, various Federal offices that serve the American people shut down, doors closed, but yet there are also faces behind those who work in those offices, with families on the brink of Christmas and in the midst of Hanukkah.

All Americans are suffering. And then I might ask about the mother who lives in the Houston area, unemployed, without any support systems, an 8-month-old who has respiratory problems, a 5-year-old with heart problems, and an 8-year-old with a brain tumor. That mother needs Medicaid, yet on the backs of those children and that mother, this Republican Congress wants to balance the budget.

Oh, we all want to balance the budget. The Democrats have stood their ground on that. The Democratic helped craft and pass a resolution that allowed this Government to remain open, signed on November 19, that said we would balance the budget, protecting Medicaid, education, Medicare, agriculture, national defense, and the veterans.

Where are the Republican members who would come to the table to pass a clean continuing resolution. This is a season to be joyous. This is a season to stand for the American people. Let us get a budget that we can all agree with.

CEO'S CALL FOR END TO GRIDLOCK

(Mr. KINGSTON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, yesterday when the President failed again to offer a balanced budget, he proved once more that old Democrats do not morph into new Democrats. In fact, it is clear that old Democrats do not even die, they just fake away. They fake at balancing the budget, they fake at negotiations, they fake at ending welfare as we know it, and they fake at inhaling.

Well, today the CEO's across America have had enough. They have taken out this full page ad in the Washington Post saying end the gridlock, Mr. President. These are folks from Ford, General Motors, Circuit City, Toys-R-Us. What they are asking the President to do is what the Congress has already done: Use realistic numbers and the CBO scoring to balance the budget in 7 years. And I would say if the President will come to the negotiating table and do what he promised to do 3 weeks ago, then we can resolve this.

I, for one Member of Congress, agree with the CEO's and the major employers across the Nation. I am going to sign my name to this. I invite my fellow Republicans to do the same, and I invite my fellow Democrats. If you agree with this, please put your name on this in front of the American people.

CEO'S DEMAND MORE CORPORATE WELFARE

(Mrs. SCHROEDER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, OK, everybody, watch who signs up. Watch who signs up, because we now know what the issue is. These are the CEO's demanding that they have more corporate welfare and they want us to kill Medicare. They want us to kill the things that mean a lot to the middle class so they can continue on with their golden parachutes, the great tax cut that they have been promised, and they want their Christmas to come.

Well, I am here not representing the CEO's, the fat cats of America. I am

here representing the average American. Never have we had a Congress so stupid that it closed the Government down once, but twice. These Republicans do not learn. But how pleased I am they smoked out their supporters.

I hope you guys all sign up, back the CEO's of America. Be proud you are for corporate welfare. I am proud I am not. I am for Medicare, I am for Medicaid, I am for student loans, and I am for standing up for what built this country.

LAST CHANCE FOR A BALANCED BUDGET

(Mr. KNOLLENBERG asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. Mr. Speaker, let me just suggest to the gentlewoman from Colorado that I am for those same things. I am for protecting Medicare, for protecting education, I am for protecting Medicaid.

Mr. Speaker, this is the last best chance perhaps that we will have to balance this budget. We have a window of opportunity right how to do the right thing for the American people.

The Republican majority has a plan. I do not see one coming from the President. He says he wants to balance the budget, to produce a plan, yet he has not produced a plan. He has not even shown us his plan. Instead of working with the Republican majority to find some common ground, he continues to mislead America with imaginary spending cuts on Medicare, Medicaid, education, and so forth.

The President's philosophy seems to be to scare the children, scare the poor, scare the veterans, and scare the seniors. As 1995 comes to an end, the American people need to know that the only thing standing between them and a balanced budget, lower taxes, lower interest rates, and more jobs, is the President, President Clinton.

Mr. Speaker, the majority stands ready to work with the President. It is time for him to provide leadership and help us end the days of spend now, and worry later.

PRESENT A RESPONSIBLE BALANCED BUDGET

(Ms. VELÁZQUEZ asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Mr. Speaker, last time the Republicans shut down the Government because the Speaker was unhappy with his seat on Air Force One.

Now, the Republicans have shut down the Government because the President will not accept a budget agreement that would devastate health care for the elderly and the poor while giving a huge tax break to the rich.

The Republicans are holding the Government hostage in order to force their

budget priorities on this country. When are Republicans going to realize that the majority of Americans reject their mean-spirited budget proposal?

A balanced budget should not come at the expense of the elderly. Let's balance the budget by giving less for defense and ending sweetheart deals to special interest groups.

Mr. Speaker, I urge you to honor the commitment you made last month with the President and give us a responsible balanced budget that protects children and education and stop this mean-spirited attack on seniors.

PASS BALANCED BUDGET NOW

(Mr. BASS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BASS. Mr. Speaker, yesterday by a vote of 351 to 40, with 133 Democrats joining a unanimous vote on the part of the majority, we passed a resolution reaffirming our commitment to a balanced budget in 7 years using honest numbers.

Well, today we are going to have the second part of the story here. We are going to bring up the President's budget for a vote. We are going to find out just how unanimous the support is among Republicans and Democrats to vote for the President's budget. It is time that we got the basic issues here, and that is do we really support a balanced budget in 7 years?

It has been 12,093 days since the President promised us a 5-year balanced budget. It is time for Republicans and Democrats who agree on saving this country for our children and our children's future to get together and make the President as relevant as he has been all through the 1995, which is irrelevant, and pass a balanced budget over his veto.

GOVERNMENT SHUTDOWN

(Mr. GUTIERREZ asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GUTIERREZ. Mr. Speaker, all around Washington, we hear the sounds of the season. Not the holiday season—the budget season.

We hear the word furlough float through the air. Who gets furloughed if the Government keeps shutting down?

But the key question is not furlough—it is how low? How low will the Speaker stoop to satisfy special interest sponsors? How long will GINGRICH sink America's seniors into debt just to pay-off his own political debts?

With every shutdown, we hear the question: Who is essential? But the key question is not who is essential, but what is essential?

To Republicans, essential means the wealth of the upper-class rather than the health of the middle-class. To the GOP, essential means the priorities of powerful political patrons—rather than public programs that protect people.

You hear the GOP say they are making history. But you will not hear them discuss the history of the Reagan-Bush era—and the trillions of dollars of debt they racked up. Those Republicans busted the budget by shifting the tax burden to working families and cutting the safety-net for the most vulnerable.

Sound familiar? As we have all heard one Republican say, "there they go again."

USE HONEST NUMBERS TO BALANCE THE BUDGET

(Mr. COX of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. COX of California. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the stock and bond markets sent a unmistakable signal to Washington: Balance the budget. Congress, the House and the Senate, have passed a balanced budget, the first in decades. The President has vetoed it, claiming that it cuts Medicare spending. In fact, as Hillary Rodham Clinton testified on Capitol Hill very recently, the President's own proposal was to reduce the rate of growth in Medicare spending from around 12 percent to around 7 percent. The budget that was passed by this Congress increases Medicare spending more than 7 percent in every year.

The President of the United States is hiding behind this distortion, this lie, about Medicare, because he wants to avoid balancing the budget.

Yesterday this Congress sent him another message: Balance the budget using honest numbers. Do not cook the books. Do as you promised, standing right here; use the Congressional Budget office figures. The budget the President submitted is \$115 billion out of balance. Let us get to work. Let us do it for America's future, for our children, and for our grandchildren.

LET FEDERAL EMPLOYEES WORK

(Mr. MORAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Speaker, yesterday at a press conference Speaker GINGRICH indicated that there were a great many House Republicans who objected to paying Federal employees for not working. Fair enough. Federal employees do not want to get paid for not working. They want to work. We ought not repeat a situation where we paid out \$750 million to Federal employees for not working. They should have been at work then, and they certainly should be at work now.

There are two things the Speaker could do to rectify the situation. One, we have legislation we are trying to get to the floor that would keep Federal employees on the job and reimburse them subsequently when appropriation became available.

The second thing to do is just what we did during the Reagan administra-

tion, the Bush administration, the Nixon administration and every administration prior. When we had a conflict between the executive and the legislative branches, you pass a clean continuing resolution at the lower of the House or Senate level. You keep the Government functioning. You do not hold Federal employees hostage. And that is what we are doing, and to do it at Christmastime is wrong. It is mean-spirited.

I was in a school yesterday and the principal and teachers came up and said, "You know, these children are not happy like they should be at Christmas time. Their parents are fighting, their parents do not know what the future holds, they are not buying Christmas presents." We have ruined their Christmas, and it is wrong.

□ 1030

REPUBLICAN PROMISE TO BALANCE THE BUDGET

(Mr. BOEHNER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BOEHNER. Mr. Speaker, let me remind my colleagues of the fact there was an election in November 1994 when the American people decided to make a great change in this Congress. For the first time in 40 years they decided to put Republicans in charge of both Houses of Congress.

Over this past year we have kept our word to the American people. The central promise that we made to them is that we would balance the budget in 7 years using honest numbers. And all year we have done that by increasing the amount of money for Medicare, increasing the amount of money for Medicaid, increasing the amount of money for student loans.

Mr. Speaker, during the last shutdown of the Government, the President decided that he would finally agree with us; that we would balance the budget in 7 years using honest numbers. But over the last 29 days, the President has not kept his word. He has done nothing to further the commitment that he made to the American people that he would balance the budget in 7 years.

Now, the long and short of this is that we are going to keep our word to the American people. We are going to do what we promised we would do. It is time for the President to keep his promise.

THANKS TO SPEAKER GINGRICH WE ARE AT DAY NO. 4 OF SHUT- DOWN NO. 2

(Ms. WOOLSEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, thanks to Speaker GINGRICH and the new majority, today is day No. 4 of Government shutdown No. 2. All in the last 2

months. As far as I'm concerned, that's 4 days and 2 shutdowns too many.

Yes, my friends, we're at this point again because Speaker GINGRICH and the new majority just can't seem to do their job. They haven't done their job when it comes to passing the spending bills needed to keep the Government running.

And, they haven't done their job when it comes to living up to their side of the deal to deliver a budget that protects Medicare; Medicaid; education; the environment; and poor children.

Unfortunately, for the Nation, when the new majority doesn't do its job, we all suffer—crucial services for the elderly; veterans and National Parks have, once again, been cut off, and the stock market is now dropping. This Nation can't afford another day of Speaker GINGRICH's Government shutdown. It's time to stop the partisan bickering; pass a temporary funding bill; and get to work on a balanced budget that protects Medicare; Medicaid; Education; the environment; and poor children.

BUDGET IMPASSE TO BLAME ON STOCK MARKET PLUMMETING

(Mr. KOLBE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, the stock market plummeted by over 100 points. That is the biggest drop in nearly 4 years on a single day. I do not think we need to ask why. Investors, market analysts, traders, economists and, yes, common folks that buy and sell stocks are telling us why. They are worried that for the first time that this budget impasse is going to continue. They thought we were going to have a 7-year balanced budget. They thought at the end we would get that. But now they see the intransigence of this President; that we may not actually get a 7-year balanced budget, and they know what that means.

It means that we are talking about higher interest rates. It is the American family that will suffer. They will be paying more for their automobile. They will be paying more for their children's education. They will be paying more for their mortgage because we cannot get a 7-year balanced budget. We cannot do what we have to do in order to get interest rates down so that American families can thrive; and so that, yes, those CEO's somebody was talking about earlier can make jobs for Americans.

That is what this budget is all about. It is for our future. It is for our children's future and we should do it now.

SPEAKER GINGRICH NAMED MAN OF THE YEAR

(Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, congratulations on being named man of the year. The Speaker has had an impact on our country, but has the Speaker's impact been good? The poll that accompanies this article, "The Man of the Year" article, appears to demonstrate that the American people do not believe the impact has been good.

"Which descriptions apply to the Speaker," asked the poll. Listen to this. Only 24 percent described the man of the year as someone they could trust. Only 26 percent describe him as someone they would be proud to have as a leader in Congress. Even worse, 63 percent described the Speaker as too extreme in his views.

The Speaker has had a impact. He has had an impact on the country, but I hope and pray that cutting Medicare, cutting education funding, and cutting crime fighting funding to finance a tax break for the wealthy is not the way to become Time magazine's "Man of the Year." nor do I believe that shutting down the Government twice to win concessions from the President, concessions which include severe cuts in Medicare, Medicaid, education, and crime fighting, while simultaneously providing extreme tax breaks before we balance the budget, is the most upstanding way to become "Man of the Year."

PRESIDENT WOULD RATHER SEE SHUTDOWN CONTINUE THAN TO SUBMIT A BALANCED BUDGET

(Mr. CHAMBLISS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CHAMBLISS. Mr. Speaker, it has been 29 days since the President agreed to enact a 7-year balanced budget, and Congress is still waiting for President Clinton to produce a serious budget. I am led to believe that the President would rather see the shutdown of the government continue than to submit a balanced budget.

Congress, as I emphasize that word, "Congress", because in a bipartisan effort, a bipartisan effort of Republicans, and Democrats kept our end of the bargain. We submitted a balanced budget in 7 years that met the CBO standards, but the President vetoed that.

Since that veto, the President has failed to present a legitimate alternative. His only attempt at a balanced budget is \$365 billion out of balance. \$115 billion of that comes in the last year and higher amounts in between.

Mr. Speaker, it is all very simple. If the President wants to avoid the continuing shutdown, let him submit a balanced budget that we can lay on the table, talk about, and it will pass in this Congress if it meets CBO numbers.

237 MEMBERS VOTED AGAINST SENDING TROOPS TO BOSNIA AND HERZEGOVINA

(Mr. PETERSON of Florida asked and was given permission to address

the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PETERSON of Florida. My friends, the magic number is 237—237 Members of the House of Representatives last week voted against this resolution. This resolution said that the House of Representatives unequivocally supports the men and women of the United States Armed Forces who are carrying out their mission in support of peace in Bosnia and Herzegovina with professional excellence, dedicated patriotism, and exemplary behavior.

Two hundred and thirty-seven Members of the House of Representatives cannot even agree on supporting the troops in Bosnia. Does that tell my colleagues something about the possibility of a budget deal? Ladies and gentlemen, this is a disgrace. It is a disgrace to this Nation. I have never been so disappointed in my life to see people walk up here and cast a "no" vote against support of the troops.

PRESIDENT IS FAILING TO HONOR COMMITMENT MADE ON NOVEMBER 20, 1995

(Mr. TIAHRT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. TIAHRT. Mr. Speaker, yesterday Congress voted to overwhelmingly support the agreement that President Clinton signed into law on November 20, 1995, stating that Congress and the President shall enact a 7-year, CBO-scored balanced budget. The vote proved that the President is failing to honor his commitments and his word.

Today should also be very interesting. Later, Congress will debate and vote on the President's fourth budget. Just like the first three, it fails to balance. And just like the other budget, it fails to address issues like the solvency of Medicare or reprimands to agencies like the Department of Energy, where Secretary O'Leary is spending millions of dollars on overseas travel where she has no responsibility.

President Clinton is long on spending, short on ideas. He is unable to present a balanced budget and he is unable to be honest about the details about the budget that is before him, just as he is dishonest about the details of Bosnia.

EMERGENCY ASSISTANCE TO UNEMPLOYED NOT AVAILABLE DUE TO GOVERNMENT SHUTDOWN

(Mr. REED asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. REED. Mr. Speaker, I have heard some callously suggest that if you shut down the Government no one would notice.

Well, Mr. Speaker, nothing could be further from the truth.

In my home State of Rhode Island, 27 Almacs supermarket stores have gone

out of business during the holiday season.

Normally, these 2,000 workers from Almacs would be eligible for emergency assistance from the Labor Department. But, with the shutdown, there is no one to process the State's application for assistance, and as a result, there will be no help for the families of Almacs workers during the holidays. And that, Mr. Speaker, is a shame.

The Speaker could have prevented the shutdown and responded to last year's call for an end to gridlock. Because right now gridlock is back.

The Republicans have a 7-year budget plan that is just too extreme, and they know it.

I am glad the President did the right thing to protect the education, health care, and the environment.

Mr. Speaker, I urge you to end the politics and start serious negotiations.

MEDICARE PLAN NOT GOING TO KILL MEDICARE

(Mr. GANSKE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GANSKE. Mr. Speaker, I was in my office a few minutes ago when I heard a statement made on the floor that I felt I had to respond to. I would be ashamed to stand on this floor and say that the balanced budget plan, the Medicare plan is going to kill Medicare. That is simply not the case.

I can speak with some credibility to this because I am a member of the Committee on Commerce, and in my opening statement on the markup I said that I thought a savings of \$270 million would be tough and that it would be my preference to lower those. And the fact of the matter is that the current budget numbers are significantly lower in terms of the savings from Medicare. This is a message that I think we are obscuring.

Can these savings be done that would still give quality Medicare? As a physician, I think so. But I will tell my colleagues what will happen if we do not. If we do not reform Medicare, in 6 years there are, I understand, insufficient funds to pay the bills. Let us get past the demagoguery.

FURLOUGHED FEDERAL EMPLOYEES

(Ms. MCCARTHY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. MCCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, thousands of Federal employees in my district are once again furloughed and nine cabinet-level agencies plus EPA and NASA serving millions of Americans have shut their doors.

The Republican leadership for a second time has chosen to use American taxpayers as pawns in an effort to compromise the President's vow to protect

Medicare, Medicaid, education, and the environment.

The Republican leadership has failed in its responsibility to the American people to enact a budget. This failure has wide-ranging effects.

It's not just the Federal employees who are prevented from working. Crucial services to the American public are not available: FHA mortgages are going unprocessed; small businesses are not receiving assistance; and veterans' benefits may be delayed.

As a former member of the Missouri State Legislature and chairman of the House Ways and Means Committee—we balanced our budget while protecting vital services and passed our spending measure every single year. We do it at the State level as do county's and cities and business and homes and we should be able to do it at the Federal level.

It is time to work together to get the job done. It is time to pass necessary spending bills and to offer a budget resolution that protects the values of the American people. The American people want teamwork and this is what we as Democrats insist upon.

PRESIDENT SHOULD BE KEEP HIS COMMITMENT TO AMERICAN PEOPLE

(Mr. CANADY of Florida asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CANADY of Florida. Mr. Speaker, just moments ago the President signed into law the Lobby Disclosure Act of 1995. I am very pleased that the President has taken this action, and I congratulate the President on his support for this important reform measure.

But today, as we are facing a Government shutdown, as we are facing the challenge of balancing the budget, I must remind the President of something he signed into law just a few days ago. The President signed this language into law: "The President and the Congress shall enact legislation in the first session of the 104th Congress to achieve a balanced budget not later than fiscal year 2002, as estimated by the Congressional Budget Office."

This is a solemn commitment that the President has made to the American people, and I believe that the President is obligated to come forward with a plan which will accomplish this goal. The President said he would do it, now is the time to do it.

The House, last night, voted resoundingly on a bipartisan basis to support the same goal. We can do it. The President needs to put his plan on the table.

NOT A SEASON OF JOY FOR FURLOUGHED WORKERS

(Mrs. CLAYTON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. CLAYTON. Mr. Speaker, this is the Christmas season. This is the observation of Hanukkah. Both of those religious communities now celebrate what should be a joyful season. It is the season of Advent. It is the season where we have certain words that come to mind, like sharing of family values and those things that are essential. It is the season where we learn to give within our means. I hope it is the season that is instructive to us as we are debating the balanced budget.

It certainly is not a season for joy for those workers who have been furloughed. There does not seem to be a sense of fairness when the poor must suffer while the rich are given big tax breaks. It is certainly not the season for living within your means when indeed we find the deficit will go up at the end of 7 years rather than go down.

Yes, this is the season where we should be reasonable people. I would expect that reasonable people will learn how to compromise. Shame on us in this season of joy, this season of Advent, when we bring such discord, such dis-joy and such pain on the most vulnerable. We should be sharing our wealth not taking away health care for the vulnerable people of this country.

□ 1045

STOP WEAVING FABLES AND TELL THE TRUTH

(Mr. MICA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MICA. Mr. Speaker, how could the President of the United States gather little schoolchildren for a media event backdrop to veto a bill and not tell them and the American people the truth?

Mr. Speaker, our President should remember the story of Pinocchio when he weaves these fables. The President and the American people should know what is happening with their Federal Environmental Protection Agency and hazardous waste dollars. The truth is the General Accounting Office has said raw politics, not public health or safety, is the prime consideration for picking cleanup sites.

The truth is that 85 percent of Federal Superfund money goes for attorney fees and studies. The truth is that we have doubled the size of the Environmental Protection Agency in Washington, with almost 9,000 bureaucrats in Environmental Protection Agency downtown just a few miles from here.

The truth is that even the courts say that cleaning up dirt to an edible standard is wasteful and ludicrous. We need to stop weaving these fables and tell the truth.

CONTINUING RESOLUTION FOR D.C. KEEPS CITY'S HEART BEATING, BUT BREAKS THE HEARTS OF CITY'S RESIDENTS

(Ms. NORTON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1

minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise to ask the support of this body for a continuing resolution for the District of Columbia, which will come before this body this afternoon.

Members will shake their heads when they see it, for if we were to ask what is the least we could do to carry out our responsibilities to the Nation's Capital, this would be it. Allow the District to spend its own money for a little more than a week and get no part of its Federal payment.

Mr. Speaker, this comes close to humiliation for the 600,000 people I represent, who are not allowed any access to their Federal payment, even though they are second per capita in Federal income taxes in this country.

But a worse humiliation would be the total catastrophe of a second shutdown of the District on its own money. There have been several agreements that would have broken this impasse, but each time some person or the other simply turned over the tables.

Our appropriation has been delayed for 3 months now. No city can survive this way. It has delayed reform, taken it off the table and forced the District into crisis management.

Today's continuing resolution keeps the city's heart beating, but it breaks the heart of my 600,000 good residents.

PRESIDENT HAS ALREADY AGREED TO PRECONDITIONS IN BUDGET DEBATE

(Mr. HOKE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. HOKE. Mr. Speaker, I do not know if you watched the news shows this weekend, but the drumbeat has been from the Chief of Staff, Leon Panetta, that the President would meet with leaders of Congress provided that there are no preconditions. No preconditions. No preconditions. It is a mantra he has been repeating and he has been beating.

Mr. Speaker, 29 days ago the President signed a piece of paper that, in fact, did have one single precondition. It was very simple. It said that he agreed the President and the Congress should enact legislation in the first session, that ends at the end of December, to achieve a balanced budget not later than the fiscal year 2002. As estimated by whom? By the Congressional Budget Office.

That is the only precondition, but it is a very real precondition and it is an important precondition. How can the President now be saying that he is not going to even meet, he will not even talk unless there are no preconditions. Obviously, what the President has decided, what the Chief of Staff has decided, is that they are going to take the lowest road they possibly can and demagogue this right through Christmas.

CONGRESS SHOULD DEAL WITH THE REAL PROBLEMS FACING AMERICA

(Mr. HINCHEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HINCHEY. Mr. Speaker, first of all, with regard to what the previous speaker said, there were other preconditions. The President agreed to a balanced budget so long as that balanced budget protected Social Security, protected Medicare, protected education, and protected the environment.

Mr. Speaker, the budget that these people want to pass on this side of the House does none of that. But what about that resolution that was passed yesterday? It is a nonbinding resolution that says that we should balanced the budget in 7 years. What is the validity of that number? None whatsoever. The Speaker dreamed it up. It might as well have been 5 or 9 years.

Furthermore, there will be 3 Congresses here between now and the year 2002. Neither of those 3 Congresses will be bound by what this Congress has done. They will have to deal with the economic realities of the situation. What will those economic realities be? If you believe the Congressional Budget Office numbers, which is what that resolution said, the economic realities will be this: A recession; perhaps a deep and serious one.

Let us be serious here. Let us deal with the real problems facing the people of this country. It is the economic problems. It is the creation of more jobs and a sound economic budget; not the one that was passed here by this majority.

PRESIDENT SHOULD DO WHAT ALL AMERICANS DO: BALANCE THE BUDGET

(Mr. LAHOOD asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LAHOOD. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the House passed in a very bipartisan fashion, with many Democrats, a sense of the Congress resolution to balance the budget. Earlier this year, we passed a balanced budget amendment with 300 votes.

Now, apparently, Democrats too want a balanced budget. If there is one thing that the American people understand, it is balancing the budget, because they balance their budget year in and year out. They cannot understand why we cannot get our act together.

Mr. Speaker, there is really only one person standing in the way of all of this. It is not the Democrats, because they are with us. It is not the Republicans, because we have got a balanced budget that we sent to the President. So, we ask the President to join with us; join with his Democrat colleagues; join with us and do what all Americans

do. Balance the budget. Balance the Federal budget. End waste. Do what all Americans do. Make the ledger sheet balanced, and then we can move on to other important issues.

DO WE CUT TAXES OR DO WE HELP SENIOR CITIZENS AND CHILDREN

(Mr. GEJDENSON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GEJDENSON. Mr. Speaker, what is clear here is that the Republicans are intentionally avoiding the issue at hand. We can do that with the Senate. Senator DOLE and Senator DOMENICI are ready for an agreement that will keep the Government running while we debate a very serious issue, whether or not 60 percent of a \$245 billion tax cut goes to people who make over \$200,000 a year or whether we cut \$270 billion from the anticipated cost of Medicare. That is the only debate here.

Before we shut the Government down because the Speaker got a bad seat. Now we are shutting the Government down because the Speaker has worse poll numbers than Richard Nixon when he left office.

Let us not take out the Speaker's bad seat or bad poll numbers on the American people. Let us do what previous Congresses did when they were responsible, even when they disagreed with each other. They kept the Government running, and they had that debate. The debate is pretty basic: Do we cut taxes by \$245 billion or do we help protect seniors and children?

WE NEED A BUDGET THAT BALANCES IN GOOD TIME BUT PROTECTS THE ECONOMY

(Mr. NADLER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, the Republicans have shut down the Government because they claim that we have to have a balanced budget in 7 years based on figures provided by the Congressional Budget Office—and only the Congressional Budget Office.

Republicans have been leading many Americans to believe that if we adopt their balanced budget plan, interest rates will drop, there will be more jobs, and economic conditions for families will improve significantly.

But according to that same Congressional Budget Office, after a few years under the Republican plan, unemployment will rise and economic growth will drop.

You don't have to be an economist to know that that's called a recession.

So the Republicans are telling us that they have to shut down the Government because President Clinton won't agree to their 7-year plan for economic hardship.

We must continue to fight this plan.

THE MUCH BALLYHOOED BUDGET ACT OF 1995

(Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, in a number of nationwide publications the Republican National Committee ran the following ad:

The Republican National Committee will present a cashier's check for \$1 million to the first American who can prove the following statement is false: In November of 1995, the U.S. House and Senate passed a balanced budget bill.

On December 14, the Congressional Budget Office sent my office this letter, and the last line of it says it all: "CBO's baseline projection for the general fund deficit for the fiscal year 1996 is likely to be \$270 billion." That includes \$100 billion that will be stolen from trust funds like the Social Security trust fund.

So the much ballyhooed Balanced Budget Act, so-called, of 1995 really should have been stamped like this: "Certified \$270 billion deficit by the Congressional Budget Office."

Mr. Barbour, I am on the way to your headquarters. Break out your checkbook, make the check out to the University of Southern Mississippi development fund.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the provisions of clause 5 of rule I, the Chair announces that he will postpone further proceedings today on each motion to suspend the rules on which a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered or on which the vote is objected to under clause 4 of rule XV. Such rollcall votes, if postponed, will be taken later in the day.

UNITED STATES PARTICIPATION IN EXPO '98 IN LISBON, PORTUGAL

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 91) expressing the sense of the Congress that the United States should participate in Expo '98 in Lisbon, Portugal.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. CON. RES. 91

Whereas there was international concern expressed at the Rio Conference of 1992 about conservation of the seas;

Whereas 1998 has been declared the "International Year of the Ocean" by the United Nations in an effort to alert the world to the need for improving the physical and cultural assets offered by the world's oceans;

Whereas the theme of Expo '98 is "The Oceans, a Heritage for the Future";

Whereas Expo '98 has a fundamental aim of alerting political, economic, and public opinion to the growing importance of the world's oceans;

Whereas Portugal has established a vast network of relationships through ocean exploration;

Whereas Portugal's history is rich with examples of the courage and exploits of Portuguese explorers;

Whereas Portugal and the United States have a relationship based on mutual respect, and a sharing of interests ideals, particularly the deeply held commitment to democratic values;

Whereas today over 2,000,000 Americans can trace their ancestry to Portugal; and

Whereas the United States and Portugal agreed in the 1995 Agreement on Cooperation and Defense that in 1998 the 2 countries would consider and develop appropriate means of commemorating the upcoming quinquennial anniversary of the historic voyage of discovery by Vasco da Gama: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the United States should fully participate in Expo '98 in Lisbon, Portugal, and encourage the private sector to support this worthwhile undertaking.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN] will be recognized for 20 minutes, and the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HAMILTON] will be recognized for 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN].

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution expresses the sense of the Congress that the United States should participate in Expo '98, to be held in Lisbon, Portugal. The theme of the exposition will be "The Oceans: A Heritage for the Future."

It will commemorate both the 500th anniversary of Vasco da Gama's historic voyage of discovery over the sea route to India and the International Year of the Ocean in 1998. I hope that all my colleagues will agree that the world's oceans represent an important physical and cultural asset for mankind.

Portugal's history has been shaped by its maritime legacy, as has our own. I should add that in calling for the United States' participation in Expo '98, this resolution makes clear that the private sector should provide the means for our participation.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

(Mr. HAMILTON asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I believe events such as Lisbon Expo '98 provide an important forum for cultural and economic exchange between the people of Portugal and the United States. Portugal is a close friend, ally, and trading partner. Two million Portuguese immigrants have made great contributions to this country.

Mr. Speaker, I also support the theme of Lisbon Expo '98. I believe that more attention needs to be focused on protecting the health of our oceans. I register a single concern. Given the current Federal budget, I believe strongly that funding for U.S. participation in Expo '98 should come exclusively from the private sector. Therefore, I am pleased to learn that the

President is considering the appointment of a coordinator to raise private funds for U.S. participation in this exhibit.

Mr. Speaker, I commend the resolution to my colleagues and I urge its adoption.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. KENNEDY] who is a chief sponsor of House Concurrent Resolution 91.

(Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank Mr. POMBO, my fellow chair of the newly formed House Portuguese-American Caucus for his leadership on this issue.

I want to thank Chairman GILMAN for cosponsoring this resolution and for bringing this bill to the floor so that we could act on it before the end of the year.

As well, I want to thank Mr. HAMILTON for his support, and all of the other cosponsors for their support of this important resolution.

At this time I also want to thank my colleague from Rhode Island, Senator PELL, who introduced an identical resolution which has passed in the Senate.

The theme for Expo '98 will be "The Oceans, A Heritage for the Future." This exposition will celebrate the riches of the oceans and focus the world's attention on the pressing need to protect and preserve this resource.

Expo '98 presents a unique opportunity for the nations of the world to assess the current status of our knowledge of the oceans—how they can be used, what dangers they face, how they can be protected, and how we can work toward the sustainable development of this resource.

The United States has a special interest in Expo '98 because of our pre-eminent position as a leader in the development of environmental technologies.

Expo '98 offers the chance for the United States to demonstrate and capitalize on our leadership in the field of environmental protection and environmental technologies.

With this resolution, the House will be sending a clear message that participation in this expo is important to our national priorities—economic, environmental, and international.

With this resolution, we will be sending a clear message that Congress believes our participation should be the result of a cooperative effort between government and the private sector.

By showing our commitment, we will be able to earn commitments from United States businesses with interests in Portugal and the environment.

The United States belongs at Expo '98. We care deeply about the focus of the exposition and it is also important for us to show our commitment to one of our closest European allies—Portugal.

Expo '98 presents Portugal the opportunity to showcase its recent economic

advances and the role it will play in a more united, cooperative Europe.

The ties between Portugal and the United States are deep and old. Expo '98 will be a celebration of these ties, a celebration of an old and valued friendship.

I urge my colleague to support this resolution, and thank all of those who have already supported this resolution.

□ 1100

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. KENNEDY] for his supporting remarks.

Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BUNN of Oregon). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN] that the House suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution, House Concurrent Resolution 91.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on International Relations be discharged from further consideration of the Senate concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 22) expressing the sense of the Congress that the United States should participate in Expo '98 in Lisbon, Portugal, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate concurrent resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and, of course, I do not intend to object, I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN] for an explanation.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, by this action we will be completing action on this matter, which had already passed the Senate. Senate Concurrent Resolution 22 is identical to the House Concurrent Resolution No. 91, which the House passed a few moments ago.

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate concurrent resolution, as follows:

S. CON. RES. 22

Whereas there was international concern expressed at the Rio Conference of 1992 about conservation of the seas;

Whereas 1998 has been declared the "International Year of the Ocean" by the United Nations in an effort to alert the world to the need for improving the physical and cultural assets offered by the world's oceans;

Whereas the theme of Expo '98 is "The Oceans, a Heritage for the Future";

Whereas Expo '98 has a fundamental aim of alerting political, economic, and public opinion to the growing importance of the world's oceans;

Whereas Portugal has established a vast network of relationships through ocean exploration;

Whereas Portugal's history is rich with examples of the courage and exploits of Portuguese explorers;

Whereas Portugal and the United States have a relationship based on mutual respect, and a sharing of interests and ideals, particularly the deeply held commitment to democratic values;

Whereas today over 2,000,000 Americans can trace their ancestry to Portugal; and

Whereas the United States and Portugal agreed in the 1995 Agreement on Cooperation and Defense that in 1998 the 2 countries would consider and develop appropriate means of commemorating the upcoming quinquennial anniversary of the historic voyage of discovery by Vasco da Gama: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurrent), That the United States should fully participate in Expo '98 in Lisbon, Portugal, and encourage the private sector to support this worthwhile undertaking.

The Senate concurrent resolution was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A similar House concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 91) was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on the two concurrent resolutions just agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

CONCERNING HUMAN RIGHTS AND DEMOCRACY IN BURMA

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 274) concerning human rights and democracy in Burma and a United Nations General Assembly resolution, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. RES. 274

Whereas the military government of Burma, as a member of the United Nations, is obligated to uphold the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and all other international human rights standards and conventions to which it is a signatory;

Whereas the ruling State Law and Order Restoration Council (hereinafter referred to as the "SLORC") in Burma has refused to recognize the results of the May 1990 elections, which the National League for Democracy, led by Aung San Suu Kyi, won by a landslide;

Whereas the United Nations Commission on Human Rights in March 1995 unanimously condemned the SLORC's refusal to "take all necessary steps towards democracy in light of those elections";

Whereas the United Nations Commission on Human Rights also expressed grave con-

cern about violations of fundamental human rights in Burma, including torture, summary and arbitrary executions, massive use of forced labor including forced portering for the military, abuse of women, political arrests and detentions, restrictions on freedom of expression and association, and oppressive measures directed at ethnic and religious minorities;

Whereas the United Nations Commission on Human Rights noted that most of the 1990 democratically elected representatives have been excluded from the SLORC's "National Convention" and concluded that the convention does not "appear to constitute the necessary steps towards the restoration of democracy";

Whereas Burma continues to be one of the world's leading sites of narcotics production and trafficking and, according to the United States State Department, production of opium nearly doubled in Burma since the SLORC took power in a violent coup in 1988;

Whereas, according to the State Department's International Narcotics Control Strategy Report of March 1995, the SLORC's antinarcotics efforts last year fell far short of the measures necessary to make serious progress against the drug trade, and in addition, the SLORC's lack of control over heroin-producing areas is due to the SLORC's allowing wide-ranging, local autonomy (to ethnic armies) in exchange for halting their active insurgencies against Rangoon;

Whereas the peace agreements signed by the SLORC with ethnic insurgencies since 1989 were supposed to lead to both a decrease in opium production and economic development, but according to the State Department's report, "neither development nor a reduction in opium cultivation has occurred";

Whereas in 1948 when Burma became independent, the annual production of opium was 30 tons, Burma was then a democracy, it exported rice to its neighbors and the world, and it enjoyed a free-market system;

Whereas today Burma is one of the poorest nations in the world and its opium production has increased some 8,000 percent to about 2,575 tons (1992-1993);

Whereas the drug production increase is the consequence in large degree of the inability of the successive military governments in Rangoon to come to terms with the country's ethnic minorities and the refusal of post-1962 military-dominated regimes to permit an open pluralistic society;

Whereas it is primarily through a democratically elected civilian government in Burma, supported by the Burmese people including the ethnic minorities, that Burma can make significant progress in controlling narcotics production and trafficking;

Whereas on July 10, 1995, the SLORC responded to international pressure, including 5 resolutions by the United Nations General Assembly, by releasing Aung San Suu Kyi, who had been held under house arrest for 6 years;

Whereas 16 elected Members of Parliament remain in detention in Burma, along with thousands of other political prisoners, according to Human Rights Watch/Asia, Amnesty International, and other human rights monitoring groups;

Whereas in July 1995 the International Committee of the Red Cross (hereinafter referred to as the "ICRC") closed its office in Burma due to the SLORC's refusal to agree to allow the ICRC confidential regular access to prisoners;

Whereas the United States ambassador to the United Nations visited Burma in September 1995, met with Aung San Suu Kyi, and also met with leaders of the SLORC and urged them to "choose the path" of "democracy, rather than continued repression and

dictatorial control," and declared that "fundamental change in the United States policy towards Burma would depend on fundamental change in the SLORC's treatment of the Burmese people; and

Whereas the United Nations Special Rapporteur on Burma, Professor Yozo Yokota, visited the country in October 1995 and will deliver a preliminary report of his findings to the current session of the United Nations General Assembly: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives calls on—

(1) the Burmese Government to immediately begin a political dialogue with Aung San Suu Kyi, other democratic leaders, and representatives of the ethnic minorities to release immediately and unconditionally detained Members of Parliament and other political prisoners, to repeal repressive laws which prohibit freedom of association and expression and the right of citizens to participate freely in the political life of their country, to resume negotiations with the International Committee of the Red Cross on access to prisoners, and help control the massive flow of heroin from Burma; and

(2) the President, the Secretary of State, and the United States ambassador to the United Nations to actively support and promote a resolution at the current session of the United Nations General Assembly reiterating the grave concerns of the international community and calling on the SLORC to take concrete, significant steps to fulfill its obligations to guarantee respect to basic human rights and to restore civilian, democratic rule to the people of Burma.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN] will be recognized for 20 minutes, and the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HAMILTON] will be recognized for 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN].

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, 2 weeks ago, Aung San Suu Kyi announced that her party, the National League for Democracy, would no longer participate in Slorc's sham constitutional convention. Suu rightly pointed out that her nation could never be expected to accept a constitution that was forced upon the convention participants by the military. It was very good to learn that our representatives at the U.N. refused this week to cosponsor a U.N. human rights resolution on Burma because it did not refer to the withdrawal, and subsequent expulsion, from the national convention of delegates from Suu Kyi's party.

Slorc demands that the constitution stipulates a leading role for the military in Burma's political process and would exclude anyone married to a foreigner from assuming the office of the president. Suu is married to an Oxford professor.

Slorc claims that her decision to boycott the convention is confrontation politics. Suu was right to point out that "what they have termed confrontational is that we have asked for dialogue, which we want in order to prevent confrontation. To silence the views of people whose opinions are different by putting them in prison is far more confrontational."

I am deeply concerned that a senior official of the Slorc in response to Suu's statement called Suu a traitor who should be annihilated. That sort of remark is not taken lightly by this committee.

Our Nation has very serious reasons to be concerned about what occurs in Burma and to Suu Kyi. High on our priority is the illicit drug production that has had a devastating impact on our cities, families and schools. In 1948 when Burma became independent, the annual production of opium was 30 tons. Burma was then a democracy, it exported rice to its neighbors and the world, and it enjoyed a free-market system. It was known as the "rice bowl" of Asia. Today, Burma is one of the poorest nations in the world and its opium production has increased some 8,000 percent to about 2,575 tons in 1992-1993.

What is the reason for this massive increase? Bertil Litner, the Burma reporter for the Far East Economic Review, states in his book "Burma in Revolt," that Burmese drug production is the consequence of:

The inability of successive governments in Rangoon to come to terms with the country's ethnic minorities and the refusal of post-1962 military-dominated regimes to permit an open, pluralistic society.

Unfortunately, some U.S. officials have taken the position that the human rights problem should be kept separate from the drug problem. What these officials have failed to recognize is that the human rights problem is directly linked to the drug production. As Bertil Litner points out, the majority of the opium grown in Burma is grown so that ethnic minorities can protect themselves.

While their leaders are not angels, it is very difficult to grow anything else in those regions and they need the money for arms. Until they feel confident that a representative form of government is established in Rangoon, they will continue to grow opium just like they have for the past 40 years.

A democratic Burma led by Suu Kyi and the other members of parliament elected and thrown into prison in 1990, will help us to resolve the Burmese drug production problem that is spiraling out of control. Threatening Suu Kyi and her democratic followers threatens our Nation's efforts in the drug area.

Accordingly, I urge my colleagues to support House Resolution 274.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

(Mr. HAMILTON asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend my friend and chairman, the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN], for bringing this resolution before the House. It is a timely statement of our opposition to repressive measures practiced by the Government

of Burma and to Burma's continued failure to address the grave drug trafficking problem in a serious manner.

I believe it is important that this committee and this Congress speak up for political freedom and human rights whenever they are threatened. The United States should not, and will not, turn a blind eye toward political repression or a violation of fundamental human rights in Burma or anywhere else in the world.

Unfortunately, the people of Burma are governed by a ruthless military regime that has no understanding of the concepts of freedom or liberty or of individual rights. That is why it is important for the Congress to send a strong and unambiguous signal that clearly places the United States on the side of the Burmese people and their aspirations for democracy and human rights.

Similarly, this committee should reiterate its strong support for a vigorous attack on the very serious problem of drug trafficking.

House Resolution 274 calls on the Government of Burma to take concrete and effective action to control the massive flow of heroin from Burma. In this context, I also believe it is important for the United States to continue to support alternative development activities being conducted by the United Nations drug control program in the principal opium growing areas of Burma.

Given the limited contact we can and should have with the State Law and Order Restoration Counsel, or SLORC, I believe that these efforts have the best chance of impacting opium production in Burma at this time.

I urge the support of this resolution. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BEREUTER], the distinguished chairman of our Subcommittee on Asia and the Pacific.

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 274, the resolution concerning Burma and the U.N. General Assembly that this body is considering today is both important and timely. Recent developments have heightened tension in Burma. Burma's democratic opposition leader Aung Sang Suu Kyi recently announced that she and her party, the NLD, would boycott the national constitutional convention organized by Burma's military junta, the SLORC. SLORC responded by expelling the NLD from the convention, thus foreclosing any chance for dialog between the Government and the opposition. Without dialog between the democratic opposition and the SLORC the prospects for democracy and stability in Burma are bleak. Clearly, conditions in Burma are once again on a downward spiral.

This Member commends the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN], chairman of the House International Relations Committee, for his

tireless efforts in promoting democracy in Burma and other parts of Asia and, specifically, for his initiative in drafting this resolution. House Resolution 274 addresses the human rights and narcotics problems in Burma in a constructive way. This Member hopes that Burma's generals understand that the Congress of the United States wants to promote cooperative ties between our two countries, but that would only be possible if they take effective action to expand human rights and democracy in Burma and to clamp down on Burma's massive opium production.

The Committee on International Relations unanimously approved House Resolution 274 on December 14. This Member understands the administration has no objections to the resolution as amended and approved by the Subcommittee on Asia and the Pacific and the Committee on International Relations, which I chair.

This Member urges all of our colleagues to support House Resolution 274.

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. RICHARDSON].

(Mr. RICHARDSON asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this resolution which urges the governing State Law and Order Restoration Council to open a dialog with Aung San Suu Kyi and her National League for Democracy, release all political prisoners, repeal laws limiting freedom of association and expression, and help control the flow of heroin from Burma.

I commend Ambassador Madeleine Albright for her tremendous work on this issue. I encourage all Members to support the work of our U.N. Representative as she relentlessly pursues the cause of Burmese democracy leader Aung San Suu Kyi. Ambassador Albright had a great meeting in Burma this fall with Aung San Suu Kyi.

I join Ambassador Albright's endorsement of the recent U.N. resolution which urges the Government of Burma to cease its violations of internationally recognized human rights.

The United States did not cosponsor the U.N. resolution because it did not focus on several specific problem areas that must be recognized. Additionally, the U.N. resolution fails to take into account the impact of recent developments in Burma that have given us cause for great concern. It is imperative that the SLORC understand that the United States and the international community will not tolerate threats or actions that suppress the advancement of the democratic movement in Burma.

The bill before us today sends a message to the SLORC that is consistent with Ambassador Albright's policy.

I would like to caution Members of the risks we take by treating Burma in

the same manner as we handled South Africa under its former regime. We need to weigh the merits of isolating Burma, prohibiting trade or investment, denying access to international capital flows, and employing economic pressures to force the current military regime, SLORC, to act according to our wishes.

We need to keep in mind that the United States economic role in Burma is limited. And, while I support efforts to employ what leverage we have to our advantage, I insist that we use it wisely.

□ 1115

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. RICHARDSON] for his strong support of democracy in Burma. I know the gentleman has traveled to Burma. He was instrumental in helping to gain the release of Aung San Suu Kyi from house arrest, and we commend the gentleman for his efforts and thank him for his participation in this debate.

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BUNN of Oregon). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN] that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution. House Resolution 274, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENDING AUTHORITIES UNDER MIDDLE EAST PEACE FACILITATION ACT OF 1994

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2808) to extend authorities under the Middle East Peace Facilitation Act of 1994 until March 31, 1996, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 2808

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. EXTENSION OF AUTHORITIES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 583(a) of the Foreign Relations Authorization Act, Fiscal Years 1994 and 1995 (Public Law 103-236), as amended by Public Law 104-47, is amended by striking "December 31, 1995" and inserting "March 31, 1996".

(b) CONSULTATION.—For purposes of any exercise of the authority provided in section 583(a) of the Foreign Relations Authorization Act, Fiscal Years 1994 and 1995 (Public Law 103-236) prior to January 10, 1996, the written policy justification dated December 1, 1995, and submitted to the Congress in accordance with section 583(b)(1) of such Act, shall be

deemed to satisfy the requirements of section 583(b)(1) of such Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN] will be recognized for 20 minutes, and the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HAMILTON] will be recognized for 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN].

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 2808 temporarily extends the Middle East Peace Facilitation Act of 1994, which otherwise will expire on December 31, 1995.

That act was previously extended by Public Law 104-17, by Public Law 104-22, by Public Law 104-30, and by Public Law 104-47. H.R. 2808 extends the act until March 31, 1996, and includes a transition provision to permit the President to immediately exercise the authorities granted him by this extension.

Obviously, there have been a number of temporary extensions of the Middle East Peace Facilitation Act. We had anticipated that the most recent extension would be the last, because a new Middle East Peace Facilitation Act was included in the conference report on the Foreign Operations Appropriations Act, H.R. 1868, and we expected that bill to be enacted into law by now. Regrettably, that bill has been stalled because of a disagreement over an unrelated matter, and we are now confronted by the need to once again extend the Middle East Peace Facilitation Act of 1994.

This temporary extension was requested by the State Department, and I am not aware of any objection to it.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

(Mr. HAMILTON asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, first I want to commend the chairman, the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN] for bringing the bill before the House and to let him know that I give my full support to it. I would prefer that we had in place at this time the 18 month new Middle East Peace Facilitation Act that is part of the foreign operations conference report already approved by the House. I think a longer term MEPFA would strengthen the peace process.

Unfortunately, because another item in that conference report remains in disagreement with the other body, we need to move yet another short-term extension of the existing law at this time.

I also want to note that adopting this bill today and enacting the full 1 month MEPFA is the best possible way to pay tribute to the memory of Prime Minister Rabin and to support the quest for peace that Prime Minister Perez described here last week.

Prime Minister Perez, when he was here last week, specifically and strongly endorsed MEPFA as important to

the continued success of the peace process. We offer these two prime ministers then our support by our actions today in passing this bill. Today we have an opportunity to help the Middle East peace process move forward. I urge the adoption of the bill.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. ENGEL].

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I thank my good friend and colleague from Indiana for yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today, first of all, to say that bringing this up again, I think the fifth time, reminds me of the old saying by Yogi Berra saying: "it is deja vu all over again."

We have had these temporary extensions time and time again. This is no way to run things. This is no way to fund the Middle East Peace Facilitation Act. I think the process is, frankly, terrible.

We ought to be marking up a bill that I introduced many, many months ago to have peace facilitation, or the Helms-Pell bill, which the Senate has discussed. To me, this is the way it ought to be done, not a simple extension. Every time we come back here, a month later, 2 months later, 3 months later, nothing has been done.

I think the chairman is absolutely right: This House did pass a new Middle East Peace Facilitation Act as part of the foreign operations appropriations bill. Unfortunately, that bill is stalled due to a fight on abortion, which has nothing to do with foreign operations in terms of funding MEPFA, so we are being held hostage once again.

This ought not to be the way that we fund things. This ought not to be the way that we do things. Prime Minister Rabin lost his life in the fight for peace. Certainly as partners in the peace process, the United States ought to be doing things in a little better way:

Quite frankly, our Government here is shut down because appropriations bills were not passed. The majority here has not done its job by the end of the fiscal year and passed the appropriations bills. That is why our Government here is shut down. The Republican leadership talks about a family friendly Congress and family values in Congress, and Congress is now going to be in session not only this week, but through next week and Christmas week and so on and so forth. If we simply had a continuing resolution to keep funding the Government the way we should have because the Republican leadership did not do its job, the Government would not be shut down.

Frankly, if the Republican leadership did its job and did not stall this over a dispute on abortion, we would have a foreign operations bill, and we would not have to be doing this now with a temporary extension of MEPFA.

So I just think the leadership here has not been doing its job, and that is why we are in the pickle we are in now. We are shutting down our Government,

we are not fulfilling our obligations, we are stalling Middle East peace by not having MEPFA in place. Not only is the PLO not being funded, but the Government of Israel, the Government of Egypt, and other countries that get foreign aid are not getting their foreign aid, because, again, we are not passing the foreign operations bill, which is what we should be doing.

So while I certainly support peace and I certainly will support this, I think it is a tribute to Prime Minister Rabin and Prime Minister Perez, who came here last week, this is no way to run a Government. This is no way to run foreign operations. This is no way to have an extension for the fifth time again. We ought to be doing a markup of a separate bill and ought to be passing the foreign operations bill. I tell you, comes March 31, we could be coming here again asking for another extension. This is not fair for the Middle East peace process, and it just to me shows a tremendous lack of leadership in the way this House is run.

So, Mr. Speaker, I will support this, very reluctantly, this way, because while I certainly support peace, I think, as I have said before, that we must hold all parties to the agreements feet to the fire. I am not worried about the Israeli Government not keeping its end of the bargain, I worry about Yasser Arafat and the PLO. He has agreed to a number of things. I think we should hold his feet to the fire.

I want to see those covenants calling for the destruction of Israel removed from the PLO, from the Palestinian Council. I want the Palestinian Council to remove that. I want them to agree to everything that they agreed to when they signed the Middle East peace facilitation act, nothing more, nothing less.

But if Yasser Arafat and the PLO and the Palestinians said they would do certain things, then we ought to make them do those certain things before American aid flows. I think American aid should flow, because American aid is very, very important to the peace process. But I also think when parties say they are going to do something, they have an obligation to fulfill what they say. That is all we are looking for. That is why it is important to have new MEPFA language, not to simply keep renewing the old one.

Again, I reluctantly go along with this. I hope we will not be back here on March 31 doing the same thing all over again.

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN] that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2808.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof)

the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 2808 and House Resolution 274, as amended.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

REAUTHORIZING TIED AID CREDIT PROGRAM OF EXPORT-IMPORT BANK

Mr. CASTLE. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2203) to reauthorize the tied aid credit program of the Export-Import Bank of the United States, and to allow the Export-Import Bank to conduct a demonstration project, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 2203

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. EXTENSION OF TIED AID CREDIT PROGRAM.

(a) Section 10(c)(2) of the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945 (12 U.S.C. 635i-3(c)(2)) is amended by striking "1995" and inserting "1997".

(b) Section 10(e) of the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945 (12 U.S.C. 635i-3(e)) is amended by striking the first sentence and inserting the following: "There are authorized to be appropriated to the Fund such sums as may be necessary for each of fiscal years 1996 and 1997."

SEC. 2. AUTHORITY TO CONDUCT A DEMONSTRATION PROJECT.

Notwithstanding section 4701(a)(1)(A) of title 5, United States Code, the Export-Import Bank of the United States may conduct a demonstration project in accordance with section 4703 of such title.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Delaware [Mr. CASTLE] will be recognized for 20 minutes, and the gentleman from New York [Mr. FLAKE] will be recognized for 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Delaware [Mr. CASTLE].

Mr. CASTLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, today I rise in support of H.R. 2203, a bill that protects American businesses from unfair trading practices of other countries, primarily Japan and Germany. I am grateful to enjoy the support of Representative JIM LEACH, chairman of the Committee on Banking and Financial Services. On the other side of the aisle, Representative GONZALEZ, former committee chairman, and Representative FLAKE, the ranking member of the subcommittee have provided their strong support

for this legislation, and I appreciate their efforts.

Mr. Speaker, the Subcommittee on Domestic and International Monetary Policy has primary jurisdiction over the tied aid credit program of the Export-Import Bank. A subcommittee hearing and markup was held on September 7, 1995, and H.R. 2203 was favorably reported out of subcommittee by voice vote. The previous authorization expired on September 30, 1995; American exporters have been at a severe disadvantage since then. This authorization is necessary to protect American exporters and their trading in developing countries.

Mr. Speaker, the tied aid program is an important tool for American companies against international exporters. The tied aid matching authority allows the Ex-Im Bank to respond to American exporters' need for competitive financing in developing markets. Tied aid, in the form of grants and loans, is defined as below-market rate concessional financing, used for purchasing capital tools manufactured in the developed country. By matching foreign countries' offers of aid, the Ex-Im Bank has forced those countries to withdraw several of their offers, and has matched 33 other offers worth almost \$2 billion of potential export sales. Additionally, the Ex-Im Bank's tied aid credit has had a chilling effect on excessive use of tied aid by foreign countries.

Mr. Speaker, the tied aid program levels the playing field of international trade, and permits recipient countries to compare project on the basis of price, technology, quality, delivery, and service. The manager's amendment substitutes an indefinite authorization for tied aid credits in place of the authorization contained in the introduced bill of \$500 million per year. Previous spending has not exceeded \$100 million per annum. This bill does not affect direct spending on receipts, and is not subject to pay-as-you-go procedures.

H.R. 2203 protects American trade and businesses. I urge its immediate adoption.

□ 1130

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 2203, a measure to reauthorize the tied-aid authority of the Export-Import Bank. In the past, I have supported this measure, and I will do so again today. However, given the gravity of the current debate over the size and purpose of various government agencies, I have welcomed the opportunity to learn about the efficacy of the Export-Import Bank. Moreover, I wish to personally thank the distinguished Ex-Im president and chairman Kenneth Brody. Chairman Brody is leaving the Bank for other endeavors, and in doing so, the United States is losing one of its champions of increased exports.

My fellow colleagues, I have been amazed at the intensity of the debate on whether or not we should fund, or even have the Export-Import Bank. Both those who are in favor of the Bank, and those who vehemently oppose it have executed overwhelmingly comprehensive lobbying campaigns. The result is that we have a broad spectrum of opinions as to how much closing the Bank will save the American taxpayer, and it is no surprise that several Members of Congress have sometimes staked their positions on this aspect alone. I must note for the record, however, that savings is not the only issue, and to make it the only issue is shortsighted.

Most of our competitors in the industrialized world use economic credit agencies to assist their exporters, and thus foreign governments seek to ensure the viability of their industries in an ever increasing atmosphere of competitiveness. Beyond this one aspect there are many salient issues, and probably more important to our constituents, is the fact that exporting to emerging markets is probably the only area where American business can expect to grow in the future. To the extent that tied-aid is just one tool that the Ex-Im Bank uses to further this projected growth, I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 2203.

Tied aid is one of the strongest tools Ex-Im has when it attempts to deter foreign governments from offering concessional financing to borrowing countries. Tied aid represents perhaps the most overt and most distorting subsidy associated with export credit assistance. The Ex-Im Bank aptly describes this practice as the buying of export deals because perpetrating countries extend concessional funding packages in exchange for the purchase of its products. When U.S. companies face competition backed by tied aid, there is little doubt that they will lose bids without Ex-Im matching support.

We would be remiss and should be embarrassed if we were to take several steps backward in not passing this bill, and thus cripple American export business. U.S. exporters are benefiting from Ex-Im's matching policy, because of the overall reductions in global tied aid. From the Ex-Im banks bottom line perspective, given our strong deterrent use of tied aid matching, U.S. exporters are in fact competing on a more level playing field, and yet have kept their gloves on in a competitive fistfight.

In closing Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank Chairman CASTLE and his staff for their cooperation in finally moving this legislation to the floor, and regret that Congress as a whole does not have the relationship that we have established in this subcommittee. The public would be better served if we could extend our cooperation to other issues, and to other committees.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CASTLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I have no other speakers, so the gentleman from New York [Mr. FLAKE] may want to call on anyone else he may have, but I would like to say before we yield back, if we are going to do that, that Mr. Ken Brody will be leaving his position as president and chairman of the Export-Import Bank, and I have enjoyed working with him. I believe him to be an excellent public servant who understands his subject matter extremely well, eliminates politics from carrying out his responsibilities, and I think has served both the administration and this country exceptionally well, and we appreciate that.

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. Speaker, I have no further speakers and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CASTLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BUNN of Oregon). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Delaware [Mr. CASTLE] that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2203, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION SESQUICENTENNIAL COMMEMORATIVE COIN ACT OF 1995

Mr. CASTLE. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2627), to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint coins in commemoration of the sesquicentennial of the founding of the Smithsonian Institution, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 2627

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Smithsonian Institution Sesquicentennial Commemorative Coin Act of 1995".

SEC. 2. COIN SPECIFICATIONS.

(a) DENOMINATIONS.—The Secretary of the Treasury (hereafter in this Act referred to as the "Secretary") shall mint and issue the following coins in commemoration of the founding of the Smithsonian Institution:

(1) \$5 GOLD COINS.—Not more than 100,000 5 dollar coins, which shall—

(A) weigh 8.359 grams;

(B) have a diameter of 0.850 inches; and

(C) contain 90 percent gold and 10 percent alloy.

(2) \$1 SILVER COINS.—Not more than 650,000 1 dollar coins, which shall—

(A) weigh 26.73 grams;

(B) have a diameter of 1.500 inches; and

(C) contain 90 percent silver and 10 percent copper.

(b) PLATINUM COINS.—The Secretary may mint and issue not more than 100,000 5 dollar platinum coins instead of the gold coins required under subsection (a)(1) in accordance with such specifications as the Secretary determines to be appropriate.

(c) LEGAL TENDER.—The coins minted under this Act shall be legal tender, as provided in section 5103 of title 31, United States Code.

(d) NUMISMATIC ITEMS.—For purposes of section 5134 of title 31, United States Code, all coins minted under this Act shall be considered to be numismatic items.

SEC. 3. SOURCES OF BULLION.

(a) GOLD.—The Secretary shall obtain gold for minting coins under this Act pursuant to the authority of the Secretary under other provisions of law.

(b) SILVER.—The Secretary shall obtain silver for minting coins under this Act only from stockpiles established under the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act.

SEC. 4. DESIGN OF COINS.

(a) DESIGN REQUIREMENTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The design of the coins minted under this Act shall be emblematic of the scientific, educational, and cultural significance and importance of the Smithsonian Institution.

(2) DESIGNATION AND INSCRIPTIONS.—On each coin minted under this Act there shall be—

(A) a designation of the value of the coin;

(B) an inscription of the year "1996";

(C) inscriptions of the words "Liberty", "In God We Trust", "United States of America", and "E Pluribus Unum"; and

(D) an inscription of the following phrase from the original bequest of James Smithson: "for the increase and diffusion of knowledge".

(b) SELECTION.—The design for the coins minted under this Act shall be—

(1) selected by the Secretary after consultation with the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution and the Commission of Fine Arts; and

(2) reviewed by the Citizens Commemorative Coin Advisory Committee.

SEC. 5. ISSUANCE OF COINS.

(a) QUALITY OF COINS.—Coins minted under this Act shall be issued in uncirculated and proof qualities.

(b) MINT FACILITY.—Only 1 facility of the United States Mint may be used to strike any particular combination of denomination and quality of the coins minted under this Act.

(c) PERIOD FOR ISSUANCE.—The Secretary may issue coins minted under this Act only during the 1-year period beginning on August 1, 1996.

SEC. 6. SALE OF COINS.

(a) SALE PRICE.—The coins issued under this Act shall be sold by the Secretary at a price equal to the sum of—

(1) the face value of the coins;

(2) the surcharge provided in subsection (d) with respect to such coins; and

(3) the cost of designing and issuing the coins (including labor, materials, dies, use of machinery, overhead expenses, marketing, and shipping).

(b) BULK SALES.—The Secretary shall make bulk sales of the coins issued under this Act at a reasonable discount.

(c) PREPAID ORDERS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall accept prepaid orders for the coins minted under this Act before the issuance of such coins.

(2) DISCOUNT.—Sale prices with respect to prepaid orders under paragraph (1) shall be at a reasonable discount.

(d) SURCHARGES.—All sales shall include a surcharge of—

(1) \$35 per coin for the \$5 coin; and

(2) \$10 per coin for the \$1 coin.

SEC. 7. GENERAL WAIVER OF PROCUREMENT REGULATIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subsection (b), no provision of law governing procurement or public contracts shall be applicable to the procurement of goods and services necessary for carrying out the provisions of this Act.

(b) EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY.—Subsection (a) shall not relieve any person entering into a contract under the authority of this Act from complying with any law relating to equal employment opportunity.

SEC. 8. DISTRIBUTION OF SURCHARGES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—All surcharges received by the Secretary from the sale of coins issued under this Act shall be promptly paid by the Secretary to the Smithsonian Institution for the following purposes:

(1) 85 percent of the amount transferred shall be available for such purposes as the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution determines to be appropriate.

(2) 15 percent of the amount transferred shall be dedicated to the support of the operation and activities of the National Numismatic Collection at the National Museum of American History.

(b) AUDITS.—The Comptroller General of the United States shall have the right to examine such books, records, documents, and other data of the Smithsonian Institution as may be related to the expenditures of amounts paid under subsection (a).

SEC. 9. FINANCIAL ASSURANCES.

(a) NO NET COST TO THE GOVERNMENT.—The Secretary shall take such actions as may be necessary to ensure that minting and issuing coins under this Act will not result in any net cost to the United States Government.

(b) PAYMENT FOR COINS.—A coin shall not be issued under this Act unless the Secretary has received—

(1) full payment for the coin;

(2) security satisfactory to the Secretary to indemnify the United States for full payment; or

(3) a guarantee of full payment satisfactory to the Secretary from a depository institution whose deposits are insured by the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation or the National Credit Union Administration Board.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Delaware [Mr. CASTLE] and the gentleman from New York [Mr. FLAKE] each will be recognized for 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Delaware [Mr. CASTLE].

Mr. CASTLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, today I rise in support of H.R. 2627, the Smithsonian Sesquicentennial commemorative coin bill. This bill has received very broad based support in this body as represented by its more than 300 cosponsors. It is also supported by the numismatic collectors and their representatives on the Citizens Commemorative Coin Advisory Committee.

Mr. Speaker, apart from the significance of the Smithsonian anniversary, the designation of 15 percent of the surcharge proceeds to benefit the numismatic collection at the Museum of American History is another reason for this support. The Smithsonian has agreed to have its coins be the first to be governed by the rules and restrictions set down in H.R. 2614, the Commemorative Coin Reform Act of 1995. As a consequence, providing the mint can prepare in time, they may also have the benefit of issuing the first platinum coinage in U.S. history.

Mr. Speaker, the Commemorative Coin program is clearly in trouble, largely because too many unpopular

coins are being produced. The mintage level of 800,000 silver \$1 coins in the Livingston bill caused some discussion during subcommittee markup. Amendments of 400,000 and 500,000 were both offered, and the ultimate compromise amendment offered to this bill is for a mintage level of 650,000 \$1 silver coins. This number was reached following representations by the CCCAC membership and the Mint reaffirming their belief that the unique marketing ability of the Smithsonian justifies a higher authorization than 400,000 or 500,000 coins.

The proponents of this bill have observed the rules of the Banking Committee by obtaining more than 290 cosponsors. This bill also demonstrates that the Banking Committee rules are not simply a block to all coin legislation, and that if a group follows the rules, they have an opportunity to get a coin.

Mr. Speaker, our actions today should not be taken as an invitation for more coin projects to advance; 1996 is already at least fully subscribed, no more coins can be considered for that year.

In the coming years, we will continue to press for full compliance with Banking Committee rules and if necessary we will recommend that they be tightened should it appear that more coins are being proposed than the market will absorb.

I urge this body to immediately adopt H.R. 2627.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASTLE. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, would it not be nice if the Smithsonian were open so that the general public, the Americans who are visiting Washington, were able to see the marvelous collection of coins that the Smithsonian usually has on display for them?

Mr. CASTLE. Mr. Speaker, I do not disagree with the gentleman at all, but I do not think this is the time to get into the discussion of why the Smithsonian is not open today. That may happen starting in about 20 minutes or so. But perhaps this is not the time. Hopefully, by the time we pass this bill it will be open and we will be able to see that.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 2627, the Smithsonian Institution Sesquicentennial Commemorative Coin Act of 1995. I also support the manager's amendment, which was reached in bipartisan agreement with strong input from Representative KENNEDY from Massachusetts. Furthermore, I commend all parties involved in this effort, including Chairman CASTLE, Mr. KENNEDY, the Mint, the Smithsonian, and the Citizens Commemorative Coin

Advisory Committee. I would also be remiss if I did not thank Mr. LIVINGSTON and our former colleague Mr. Mineta.

This act celebrates one of our Nation's most celebrated treasures, and will commemorate 150 years of excellence in the arts, sciences, and history. The Smithsonian has chronicled its own history, and I would like to state for the RECORD a brief account from the Smithsonian's history annals:

In 1826, James Smithson, a British scientist, drew up his last will and testament, naming his nephew as beneficiary. Smithson stipulated that, should the nephew die without heirs—as he would in 1835—the estate should go “to the United States of America, to found at Washington, under the name of the Smithsonian Institution, an establishment for the increase and diffusion of knowledge among men.”

The motives behind Smithson's bequest remain mysterious. He never traveled to the United States and seems to have had no correspondence with anyone here. Some have suggested that his bequest was motivated in part by revenge against the rigidities of British society, which had denied Smithson, who was illegitimate, the right to use his father's name. Others have suggested it reflected his interest in the Enlightenment ideals of democracy and universal education.

Smithson died in 1829, and six years later, President Andrew Jackson announced the bequest to Congress. On July 1, 1836, Congress accepted the legacy bequeathed to the nation and pledged the faith of the United States to the charitable trust. In September 1838, Smithson's legacy, which amounted to more than 100,000 gold sovereigns, was delivered to the mint at Philadelphia. Recoined in U.S. currency, the gift amounted to more than \$500,000.

After eight years of sometimes heated debate, an Act of Congress signed by President James K. Polk on Aug. 10, 1846, established the Smithsonian Institution as a trust to be administered by a Board of Regents and a Secretary of the Smithsonian.

Mr. Speaker, this is the first legislation to be considered under the rubric of legislation passed just 2 weeks ago under the guidance of Chairman CASTLE. I could not think of a better bill to mark our new process minting commemorative coins, and I hope that the collecting community, and the general public, will benefit from this new process. H.R. 2627 shows that the Citizens Commemorative Coin Advisory Committee process works, and that the Banking Committee will only consider CCCAC coin recommendations with the cosponsorship of two-thirds of the House.

In closing, let me say that during the subcommittee markup, I was prepared to offer an amendment to allow the minting of no more than 500,000 silver coins, which was the original recommendation of CCCAC. Valid concerns from Mr. KENNEDY were debated, and after discussion we finally arrived at a mintage level of 650,000 silver dollars coins. In the future, I strongly urge the Mint and CCCAC to resolve discrepancies early, and to report to Congress firm recommendations.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly support this bill, and urge all of colleagues to do the same.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HOYER].

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New York, my good friend Mr. FLAKE, for yielding me this time.

I rise in very strong support of this legislation. I rise for a reason in addition to that. The American public is angry with us today, as well, in my opinion, they ought to be.

□ 1145

The American public sees, on a very regular basis, the confrontation between Members on this floor and on the Senate floor and between the Congress and the President. They conclude, all too often, that all we do here is fight with one another; that we cannot, as adults, as reasonable, rational representatives of our various constituencies, come together and do things that make sense.

Mr. Speaker, I rise, therefore, to not only note that this legislation is important legislation that will not only commemorate, but will assist the work of one of the great institutions in this country, the Smithsonian Institution. My friend, who is in charge of funding the Smithsonian Institution, in exile, I should say, he and the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. REGULA] are in charge. The fact of the matter is that it is one of the great institutions of the world, as the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. YATES] so well observes.

I want to, therefore, rise and congratulate and express appreciation to one of the very decent and able Members of this House, the gentleman from Delaware [Mr. CASTLE], the former Governor of the State of Delaware. The gentleman, frankly, is the kind of representative every American wants to have. A thoughtful, hard-working, conscientious, honest individual. Not only in addressing this issue, which is a relatively minor issue, but some of the great issues that confront this House.

The gentleman from Delaware and I have had the opportunity of working together over the last few months on this particular piece of legislation. As he observed, there is a problem. The numismatic community has observed the problem of overissuance of coins and, therefore, the glutting of the market and the threatening of the value of each one of the issues.

The gentleman from Delaware has been concerned about that. The gentleman from New York [Mr. FLAKE] has expressed his concern about that. The gentleman from New York and the gentleman from Delaware together are individuals who did and do work with one another and on both sides of the aisle to try to make good common sense, and turn that into good public policy. I think they have done that in this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I also want to thank the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY]. He is the former chairman of this committee and is very interested and knowledgeable about the

whole issue of the authorization of the minting of coins. He has addressed this issue, and I appreciate very much, as the gentleman from New York has observed, his agreement to compromise between the 800,000 that the Smithsonian thought was a viable number and the 500,000 that the numismatic committee originally recommended, and then modified their recommendation because of the ability of the Smithsonian to market its coins.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Massachusetts, the gentleman from Delaware, and the gentleman from New York.

I would close, Mr. Speaker, in support of this legislation by simply mentioning one additional individual. John Berry, formerly of my staff, now works at Smithsonian and he has been very interested in this particular piece of legislation. I thank him for the energy and the tenaciousness that he has shown and congratulate him on the success of the passage of this legislation.

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman from Delaware [Mr. CASTLE] does not have any additional speakers, and before the gentleman and I get our own coins here with all of these marvelous commendations, I am prepared to yield back.

Mr. CASTLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, we do not have additional speakers. I know the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LIVINGSTON] is trying to get here. He is in a press conference, and the gentleman will submit a statement later as sponsor of the legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I would like very much to thank the gentleman from New York [Mr. FLAKE] for his very interesting history lesson on the Smithsonian, which I think is a good lesson for schoolchildren and people who may have heard it across the country. It is one that maybe even not a lot of Members know and understand.

Mr. Speaker, I also thank the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HOYER] for his very kind words and his work throughout this, and I thank the gentleman from New York for all the exceptional hard work that he and his staff do and the cooperation to allow us to get legislation like this done. If I thought it was that simple, I would suggest that we take over the budget. But we will leave it alone at this point.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Smithsonian Board of Regents, I rise in support of H.R. 2627, which authorizes the minting of a coin to commemorate the Smithsonian Institution's 150th anniversary.

I appreciate Chairman CASTLE and Ranking Member FLAKE for moving so quickly in subcommittee so that we can enact this bill in time for next year's anniversary. I also appreciate Full Committee Chairman LEACH and Ranking Member GONZALEZ for their work in moving the bill to the House floor.

The Institution is planning a number of events beginning in January 1996 to celebrate 150 years of providing education, research, and exhibitions to the American public and the world. The proceeds generated from this coin program will help finance a travelling exhibition, which will take many of our national treasures "off the mall" and display them in cities across the country. Many Americans who are unable to come to Washington will be able to enjoy a blockbuster exhibition of 350 treasured Smithsonian artifacts including the Apollo 14 space capsule, a hat belonging to Abraham Lincoln, and a Wright Brothers biplane.

This coin bill will also devote 15 percent of the proceeds to the numismatic collection at the National Museum of American History helping coin collectors invest in their own history. This provision will insure that the Smithsonian coin will have the support of the coin collecting community.

I am pleased that the interested members were able to compromise on the number of coins to be minted under this bill. While I am disappointed that we are not authorizing the full 800,000 coins as supported by the Citizens Advisory Committee, I am glad that we could compromise on the 650,000 level. The marketing opportunities provided through Smithsonian's magazine and catalogue coupled with the support of the coin collecting community, will ensure that the Secretary of Treasury will quickly sell the authorized level of coins.

This coin bill complies with H.R. 2614, the Commemorative Coin Authorization and Reform Act of 1995, which passed the House on December 5, 1995. The Smithsonian will audit all proceeds from the coin and the Comptroller General will have the right to review the audit. The Smithsonian will not receive any funding until the Treasury has recovered all costs associated with minting the coin. This bill has the support of the U.S. Mint and the congressionally established Citizens Commemorative Coin Advisory Committee, and the numismatic community.

I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 2627, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CASTLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BUNN of Oregon). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Delaware [Mr. CASTLE] that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2627, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. CASTLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members

may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on H.R. 2203 and 2627, the bill just considered, and that I may include extraneous materials for the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Delaware?

There was no objection.

PROVIDING FOR PROVISIONAL APPROVAL OF REGULATIONS APPLICABLE TO HOUSE AND ITS EMPLOYEES

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 311) to provide for the provisional approval of regulations applicable to the House of Representatives and employees of the House of Representatives and to be issued by the Office of Compliance before January 23, 1996.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. RES. 311

Resolved,

SECTION 1. APPROVAL OF REGULATIONS.

The regulations applicable to the House of Representatives and the employees of the House of Representatives which are to be issued by the Office of Compliance before January 23, 1996, are hereby approved on a provisional basis until such time as such regulations are approved in accordance with section 304(c) of the Congressional Accountability Act of 1995 (2 U.S.C. 1384(c)).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from California [Mr. THOMAS] will be recognized for 20 minutes, and the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. GEJDENSON] will be recognized for 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. THOMAS].

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GOODLING], chairman of the Committee on Education and Economic Opportunities, for a colloquy.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the resolution before us today and would like to engage in a colloquy with the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. THOMAS], the chairman of the Committee on House Oversight, regarding the jurisdiction of these resolutions.

Mr. Speaker, while this matter is within the jurisdiction of the Committee on House Oversight and the Committee on Economic and Educational Opportunities, we do not intend to delay the progress in considering this matter and support suspending the rules and passing without consideration in committee these two resolutions.

I also join the gentleman from California in his assurances that we will work to have the final regulations promptly considered by the House once we reconvene in January.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I concur with the gentleman's conclusions and obviously we share jurisdiction. The

Committee on House Oversight, primary jurisdiction; the Committee on Economic and Educational Opportunities, sequential jurisdiction. Neither one of us want to delay putting these into effect. I will support the gentleman's jurisdiction.

Mr. Speaker, the Congressional Accountability Act, which was passed on the first day of this Congress, created an Office of Compliance. It is to become effective January 23, 1996. The board of directors of the Office of Compliance have issued notice of proposed rulemaking and is in the process of reviewing those comments on the proposed regulations.

Mr. Speaker, the problem is that the board is scheduled to make final those regulations on January 8, 1996. It is our fervent belief that we are going to adjourn sine die prior to that time and not reconvene for the second session of the 104th Congress until January 23.

Therefore, this resolution provisionally adopts the anticipated regulations that are applicable to the House and at the next regularly scheduled meeting, which will be as soon as possible upon reconvening, we will review the final regulations and make a recommendation as to their final approval to the House.

Obviously, in that interim period between January 8 and January 23, we do believe it is appropriate to offer provisional approval, whatever those regulations may be. That is the intent and purpose of House Resolution 311.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GEJDENSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, this is clearly needed legislation and it needs to be implemented, not just in the technical sense, but in the spirit of the law. Some of the treatment of employees in this House over the last year, I believe, has been reprehensible. The long-time employees of this institution have been treated badly.

Mr. Speaker, I am hopeful that this new legislation will improve their lot. We ought to be an example for the Nation, not just of following the letter of the law, but the spirit of the law in dealing with our employees.

Frankly, leaving all Federal employees in a lurch over the failure to pass a continuing resolution is another example of some of the hypocrisy here, but I do commend the spirit of this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HOYER].

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this resolution. I am pleased that the process that was started in the 103d Congress is finally nearing implementation. Very frankly, we had a political discussion, in the 102d and 103d, about merit hiring and about doing away with patronage; doing away with the politicization of the ministerial duties of the House of Representatives.

Mr. Speaker, I was for that. I thought we were moving in the right direction.

In fact, we adopted in the last Congress a rule which would have said that employees could not be removed for purely political reasons. That, in fact, they would be treated as merit employees if they were performing administrative functions.

One of the first acts of this Republican leadership was, frankly, to delete that rule from the rules of the House of Representatives, while at the same time projecting legislation, which had been killed by Republicans in the Senate, as their legislation, which had been previously passed in the 103d Congress, and providing for the covering of the House of Representatives under the laws that we had passed vis-a-vis employees' rights and working conditions to the private sector, that they be applied to the Congress.

That legislation was supported by over 400 Members of this body, and as some of my colleagues may recall, I was the floor leader on this side of the aisle for that legislation.

Mr. Speaker, notwithstanding my support of that policy and this resolution, my colleagues should not be fooled that the passage of this resolution will ensure that the employees of this House will be treated fairly, equitably, and nonpolitically. I want to call to the attention of every Member of this House the recent actions that have been taking place by the Clerk.

I want to say something at the outset. I have a great deal of respect and affection for the Clerk of this House. I think she has operated in what I perceive to be an open and fair fashion over the last few months of her tenure. I appreciated that. It was, frankly, in juxtaposition to some other leaders dealing with personnel in this House, and so it was doubly appreciated.

As many of my colleagues may have read in recent press reports, however, 10 employees have recently been dismissed by the Clerk, contrary to the management plan submitted to and approved by the Committee on House Oversight; contrary to the rules of the 103d Congress, which stated that employees cannot be dismissed without cause and cannot be dismissed for reasons other than their nonperformance or malfeasance in office.

Mr. Speaker, the rules of the 104th Congress, did not include the referenced language of the 103d Congress.

Some may think that these dismissals were part of the transition, which would have been understandable, I suppose, except for the fact that the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. ROBERTS], a member of the Committee on House Oversight, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOLF], the chairman of the Subcommittee on Transportation and then the ranking member of the Subcommittee on Treasury, Postal Service, and General Government, properly expressed outrage on this floor when members of the travel office in the White House were removed, notwithstanding they served at the will of the President.

Mr. Speaker, there was an expression of outrage and, in fact, the Treasury-Postal bill was held up by the gentleman from Virginia because of that concern. I think that concern was appropriate, and I said so on the floor of this House then when it was the Clinton White House acting.

Some may think, as I said, that these were part of the transition. In fact, each of these employees were kept on through the transition, and each was in receipt of a letter from the Clerk in May offering them continued employment.

Each employee was informed that they were specifically being dismissed in December, just a few days ago, without cause.

□ 1200

I was surprised to learn these employees had all been offered continued employment prior to their dismissals. I was shocked to learn that one of the employees had, as recently as July, been given a promotion. I was shocked that one employee had been asked to make suggestions for his replacement. I do not know what that does to the morale of the employees who remain. I was appalled, Mr. Speaker, that a Vietnam veteran with 23 years' experience, who had started his employment with the House by filling out a Standard 171 Form, not a political employee, a ministerial employee, not fired for cause, a Vietnam veteran, 23 years of seniority, and just a few short weeks before that, maybe a few months, a noncitizen had been hired in this office at a comparable salary with comparable responsibilities.

Shame, shame, shame that we would treat employees so cavalierly and then stand on this floor and say how we want to protect the rights of veterans in America whom we sent overseas to defend this country and then a few days before Christmas say, "Guess what, we have a noncitizen whom we have hired who probably can do your job." That was not said specifically. I want to make that clear. But the inference is very clear. The inference is very clear. "We have got somebody else to do the job." Twenty-three years of experience.

I was further troubled, Mr. Speaker, to learn that in spite of repeated representations by many in the majority that a "nonpartisan, professional work force" was being employed, several recent hires in the Clerk's office come from the Republican National Committee. There is nothing wrong with that. Clearly, the same happened from the Democratic National Committee under Democratic leadership of this House. But it is wrong to tell the employees or to imply to the public that this is going to be merit hiring, nonpolitical, and then pursue that practice.

Earlier this year, we learned a number of senior managers in the office of the chief administrative officer are also either former staff of the Republican National Committee, the Repub-

lican National Campaign Committee, or former political appointees of the Reagan or Bush administrations. That is not wrong. I do not allege it to be wrong. What I do allege is, if you say you are going to hire on merit and retain on merit and performance, then do not replace folks with political appointees and expect your personnel to believe, in fact, they work in a merit-based system.

It is becoming increasingly apparent hiring is being done on the basis of political affiliation. What is so troubling, Mr. Speaker, about these recent firings is that each of these employees had been given the impression, as I have said, that they had been performing their jobs in a professional, competent manner. In fact, they were told they were not, I underline not, removed for cause. Each of these employees had made it through the transition period.

Let me reiterate that. They had made it through the transition period. I was told by the Clerk herself that the transition was over in the summer. I talked to her just a few days ago, and she reiterated that.

Let me make it clear, I do not question the ability of this Clerk or her attitude or fairness. But this instance is one that I think does not comport with my experience for that practice. Suddenly, after further recent partisan hirings, these employees have been dismissed. Despite repeated inquiries on my behalf, no reasonable business purpose for these terminations has yet been stated to me, and I suggest has not been submitted to the committee.

The Clerk's office has an employee manual. I have got that employee manual right here, issued by this Clerk, not a prior Clerk, in this Congress. It lays out clear steps for dismissal. Each employee was given this manual when they received their offers of continued employment, presumably so they knew the rules of the road as employees. Yet this manual and its process was ignored.

Now, very frankly, the Clerk says, "Oh, no, the employees serve at the will of the Clerk." Let me read the language: "Two steps, notice of action. Suspensions, terminations, and," conjunctive, in addition to, and counsel, I am sure, understands that interpretation, "and all performance-based actions requiring the following two-step approach"; in other words, in other words, not only do performance-based terminations require these two steps, it is an "and", but suspensions and terminations also, according to this manual, require those steps. They were not taken, period.

This was clearly a termination. They are terminated. Many Members of the House took to this well when President Clinton dismissed members of the travel office. As I said previously, they were outraged that employees were fired for seemingly partisan purposes. I was outraged because a number of them were my constituents. I think

what was done was wrong, and as chairman of the Treasury, Postal Committee, I assured that everyone but one received offers of employment in the executive department, and those who wanted it got it at comparable levels.

So let there be no mistake, when the White House did it, I thought it was wrong. When the Clerk does it, I think it is wrong.

My colleagues, I would ask that that outrage that was expressed on the Republican side of the aisle at those firings to be at least evidenced today and now.

There have been no allegations of mismanagement or poor performance by these employees. I understand that the Compliance Act relates to discrimination. That act goes into effect, of course, on January 22 of this coming year or January 23. However, each of these employees is being terminated in such a way that even if they wanted to explore their rights under that act, I believe they are precluded.

It can be argued that some of them, perhaps all, will be on the payroll technically and, therefore, may be included. We will see.

I have repeatedly raised my concerns that a goal which I strongly supported, ending patronage in the House of Representatives for ministerial employees and assuring a professional work force for the administrative functions of the House, is being seriously undermined beneath the rhetoric of professionalism.

A number of these employees have expressed concerns over their treatment in the media. It has been brought to my attention that the word has been spread that these employees better watch out. Let no one in this House be mistaken, I and my colleagues, I hope on both sides of the aisle, will not stand for any reprisals being taken against any employee for exercising their rights of free speech.

The new Republican majority may feel at will to enforce a gag rule on this House from time to time. But we ought not to, and it would be wrong to, enforce a gag rule on our employees or former employees by threats of re-primation.

Mr. Speaker, I believe these dismissals were wrong. They superficially, at least, appear to be based on partisanship. But whether they are or not, they were wrong, and they have left the staff of the House of Representatives, in my opinion, demoralized and feeling insecure.

If dismissals are not based on job performance, for those who are not involved in policy making, and clearly those employees in policy making are subject to the will of the policy maker; that is the way it must be and should be. But for those people that we ask day to day to come to this House, to come to this Capitol and perform duties for us in a professional manner, unrelated to formulation or promulgation of policy, they ought to know that if they perform, for Republicans or

Democrats, in a fashion that brings credit on this institution and facilitates the work of this House, that they will be continued in their employment.

Mr. Speaker, again, I rise in support of this resolution. I supported it as a Member of the Committee on House Oversight. The gentleman from California [Mr. THOMAS], the chairman of the Committee on House Oversight, has rightfully said that this moves the process forward. I agree with him. I am pleased that we are moving. I will vote for this legislation.

But I would hope that all of the leadership of this House would review this matter, not just for concern with these ten but concern for every person who works for this institution, people of whom we are proud, people of whom we are very appreciative for the work they do for us and for the American people, and people whom we ought to treat with respect and the dignity they deserve.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Although the argument of the gentleman from Maryland is not on the measure in front of us, I think, based upon the innuendo, the qualifiers, the rumor and gossip, the straw man argument that he constructed needs to be responded to.

Frankly, his statements are inaccurate, factually as well as in the innuendo, suggestions, and qualifiers. There were 9 individuals involved, not 10. They were employed by the Clerk in a number of activities. The Clerk continues to rethink the structure under her auspices, and, as in any business, there are restructurings that take place from time to time. This is one of those restructurings.

I find it interesting that the gentleman from Maryland indicated that he was the floor leader in the passage of the legislation that the resolution actually deals with. I am pleased to say he was the floor leader on the minority side. His party had 40 years to pass this kind of legislation. They never did. They talked a lot about it. They made innuendos at that time that it was a fair system. In fact, it was a plantation run totally by patronage.

What we did was say that that was to stop. What we are doing is restructuring this House, as we have from day 1. We continue to restructure it. We probably will not get it all done by the end of the 104th Congress, and we will probably continue as the majority in the 105th to continue to restructure.

The gentleman used a number of phrases and then couched them that that is not really what he meant, but there were rumors and gossip, and according to the media that certain things were going on.

I will tell the gentleman that he ought to rely on something other than unnamed sources in the media.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMAS. I am not going to yield at this time.

Mr. HOYER. I do not think I used any of those phrases. None.

Mr. THOMAS. I believe the gentleman, if he checks the RECORD, will find out that several times he referred to stories in the media. I believe the RECORD will show that. We will find out about it after the fact.

But I would ask unanimous consent to place in the RECORD a letter that I received from the Clerk of the House, Robin Carle—

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection.

There was no objection.

Mr. THOMAS. Reviewing some of the statements that have been made.

The letter referred to is as follows:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, December 18, 1995.

Hon. BILL THOMAS,
Chairman, Committee on House Oversight,
Longworth House Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: In light of inaccurate media reports that suggested various personnel actions of recent weeks have jeopardized or impacted the performance of the House floor, I am writing to clarify the current situation. I hope you find this information of assistance.

First, contrary to media reports by an "unnamed source", let me clearly state that at no time in the last week has the integrity of the House floor or the quality of work produced by the Offices of the Clerk suffered. Between November 30 and December 7, nine individuals in the various offices of the Clerk were informed that their services were no longer needed and that from the day forward they would be placed on Administrative Leave until January 16, 1996 and in addition provided payment for their accrued annual leave for up to 30 calendar days. While these individuals were relieved of service and their responsibilities assigned to other current personnel, at no time have these actions influenced or threatened the work of the floor or the internal administrative activities associated with the legislative process. In fact, only three of the nine individuals were employed in the Office of Legislative Operations and only one of them worked directly on the House floor.

I, obviously, evaluated the workload of my offices prior to taking these personnel actions and I was confident we would be able to maintain the timeliness and quality of Clerk operations. Although inaccurate press accounts and hallway gossip would suggest otherwise, I believe it is clearly evident that the House's ability to function did not rest solely on the shoulders of these nine individuals. The Clerk employees have and will continue to provide the high quality of service needed to support the House's legislative functions.

Over the last week, all systems and procedures of the Office of Legislative Operations have performed successfully. No irregular delays in the handling of legislative papers and no errors in the final recording of votes have occurred. Further, while a printing error on the part of the Government Print Office was discovered prior to consideration of a House Resolution, the Office of Legislative Operations was able to assist interested parties to ensure that no disruption occurred in the House's legislative schedule.

Let me stress, it is a regular occurrence, particularly during the closing days of a legislative session, for the administrative procedures related to the legislative process to play "catch up" in light of the multiple legislative actions that are occurring in a compressed period on both the House and Senate

floors. The legislative schedule of last week, despite our preparations for increased activity, was relatively calm and routine. The Clerk's offices have performed well during this busy session, but can certainly handle even more activity.

In particular, during this time of budget negotiations, individuals have raised concerns about the enrolling of appropriations measures. I am aware it has been suggested that the enrolling of the FY97 Interior and VA-HUD Appropriations Bills were somehow delayed in my offices and could not be forwarded to the President on Friday. In fact, the VA-HUD bill was completed and forwarded to the Speaker's Office for signature on Friday evening. That same evening the Office of Legislative Operations completed its work on the Interior Appropriations Bill and forwarded it back to the Committee for final actions. The Committee completed its work on the morning of Saturday, December 16, and I understand that both bills were delivered to the President at that time.

I stand ready to discuss any of these issues with you in more detail if you would find it useful.

With warm regards,

ROBIN H. CARLE.

Mr. THOMAS. The Clerk says in her letter, "First, contrary to media reports by an 'unnamed source', let me clearly state that at no time in the last week has the integrity of the House floor or the quality of the work produced by the Offices of the Clerk suffered."

The Clerk goes on to say that, "I, obviously, evaluated the work load of my offices prior to taking these personnel actions and I was confident that we would be able to maintain the timeliness and quality of Clerk operations. Although inaccurate press accounts and hallway gossip would suggest otherwise," she says, "I believe it is clearly evident that the House's ability to function did not rest solely on the shoulders of these nine individuals." I agree with her completely. As a matter of fact, very few of them were directly involved in the legislative process.

The letter goes on to analyze arguments that have been made about the inability to get the job done around here. Interestingly enough, one of the problems was a printing error on the part of the Government Printing Office. It was, of course, discovered prior to consideration of a House resolution, and it was corrected.

□ 1215

We are in the latter days of the first session, and there is always a crunch-time involved and decisions hastily made, notwithstanding the number of employees that have to be reviewed periodically.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object. Before the gentleman finished what he wanted to include in the RECORD, the Speaker said "without objection." But the fact of the matter is, he had not finished his request.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I had concluded, I heard "without objection," and, therefore, I read from the letter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair said "without objection." The

gentleman did not respond with an objection.

Mr. HOYER. The Chair, I believe, and I will not press it further, I said "without objection," before the gentleman finished his sentence.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I asked for unanimous consent, I received it, and, without objection, it was given. I then proceeded to supply for the RECORD portions of that letter that I thought were pertinent to the statement that I want to make.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure it is difficult for the gentleman from Maryland to understand that people who are employed are not guaranteed lifetime employment; that, as a matter of fact, somebody can be dismissed through no fault of their own. It happens all the time in the private sector based upon business decisions, business cycles, decisions to merge or eliminate businesses, and what will go on around here will be business decisions.

We have responsibility for running this place, and we are going to run it in a professional manner. The gentleman can from time to time come to the floor, as he has done now, and criticize those decisions. He has every right to criticize the decision. But he has to understand that people are dismissed in this world when there is no cause for their dismissal, other than the fact that there is a restructuring going on, and heaven knows, this place continues to need restructuring.

No one is guaranteed lifetime employment under this majority. Based upon his assertions, apparently that was the case under the old regime, with patronage and plantation as the model.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMAS. That is not the model that we are using in organizing this place.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMAS. I will tell the gentleman that he well knows, conjunction or not, that for business decisions, you can, without cause, dismiss people.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMAS. No, I will not yield, and the gentleman can continue to say that and I will not yield.

Mr. Speaker, based upon the CRS request that we have some modicum of decorum on the floor, can I continue my statement without the harassing yielding requests from the gentleman from Maryland?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California controls the time.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, we currently have a discrimination procedure available to us under the Office of Fair Employment Practices. If it was for discrimination, title VII of the Civil Rights Act applies. I do not believe anyone is arguing that there was discrimination.

I cannot believe the gentleman's argument about a Vietnam vet and some-

one who has permanent residence who is seeking United States citizenship deserves to even be responded to. It is that kind of pejorative placement, of course, not on his own hands, but on others and through the media, that is exactly the kind of argument that the American people are fed up with.

As the new majority, we intend to run this place in as lean a fashion as possible. There will be additional dismissals, I will tell you that right now. They will be because we are restructuring this place. It is not because someone is not doing the job that they used to have here as well as they could do it; it is that probably that job does not need to be done.

There are a number of people, I have to tell you, that are still employed here who are doing jobs that should not be done, and they will be dismissed and the job will be ended. That was the commitment the American people said they wanted out of this new majority, and we are doing it.

It seems to me that if the gentleman from Maryland has any facts based upon all of the innuendo about politics in terms of evidence to indicate that someone was not professionally prepared to do the job, notwithstanding the fact that they may happen to be a Republican. Since the old test under their majority was whether they were a Democrat or not, not whether or not they could do the job, it seems to me that if he has any evidence whatsoever, we would certainly like to take a look at it, that people were hired for partisan reasons, rather than for their professional competency, I say notwithstanding the fact that they were Republicans.

So, Mr. Speaker, what we have in front of us, once again, is a resolution that was passed by the committee for the interim approval of regulations which we believe will go into effect while we are in adjournment, and I would ask that we move on to the next resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GEJDENSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HOYER].

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, the chairman rose and responded and talked about the media. I did not say anything about the media. He talked about hallway allegations. I did not say anything about that. I think where he got that was from the letter from Ms. Carle. I was not going to object to the submission of this letter. I disagree with some aspects of it, but it is fine to have in the RECORD and we will discuss its pertinent parts.

I thought there were 10, I still think there are 10, maybe there are 9. Whether it is 9 or 10, the fact remains that a few days before Christmas, for no cause, they were told, some after 23 years of service, some after 20, some

after 19, some after 15, that their services were no longer going to be utilized by the House of Representatives. They effectively were fired before Christmas. They are still on the payroll; they will still be paid. They have comp time coming to them, they have certain leave coming to them. But the fact of the matter is we took that action.

The issue here is that in July of 1995, in reorganization, this manual was published and given to the employees, and it said if they were going to be removed, they would have certain rights. This was not complied with. Period. That is not a newspaper report, that is not hallway talk. That is STENY HOYER standing on this floor reading this very simple sentence and saying the Clerk's own rules were not complied with in this action. That was wrong, unfair, and ought to be reversed.

Mr. GEJDENSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. TRAFICANT].

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Ohio is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, I have never disagreed with the American people's votes. The Republicans are in charge and run the place, and I support that.

One of these fellows that was let go was a Vietnam vet, did not come here under patronage, filled out a general application, and was instructed as of July that he would be free and clear and ended up purchasing property, an individual that fought hard to get the gentleman from Florida, BILL YOUNG, a voting booth in the back.

One of these new hires is a noncitizen with a green card. I think that is the problem with the country here. I think it starts in the Congress of the United States. I think this is a damn shame. And from what I am hearing now, there will be more dismissals.

Take this staff. They start at 10 in the morning. If some long-winded politicians should have special orders until 2 o'clock the following morning, they are here. Now, they are looking over their shoulder worrying if they are going to have a job.

We passed an accountability act, an accountability act that would in fact make Congress sensitive to the laws of the land. My God, we have uprooted families. In July we were supposed to have been beyond this.

This is wrong. The Congress of the United States should stand for more than this. And when an individual comes in here without patronage, without a sponsor, and is fair to everybody on both sides of the aisle, a Vietnam vet, it is a week before Christmas, set loose, 1 day, 1 week before the January 23 deadline, officially, look, everybody is saying they do not question the Clerk. I question the Clerk, and the Clerk is not the boss around here. She is not in charge. The Republican majority is in charge, and I think you should do what is right on this and put to rest this dismissal business. We have

good quality people. We should be keeping them and reinforcing them, not scaring the hell out of them.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to place in the RECORD a letter to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HOYER] from the Clerk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

Mr. HOYER. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, and I do not intend to object, first of all, let me ask, is this the letter of December 13?

Mr. THOMAS. I will tell the gentleman, this is the letter of December 18.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I have that copy as well. I will not object, but simply reiterate that I want to make it clear, because she says that I question her abilities or her abilities have been questioned, I do not question that. There are some other things in the letter with which I disagree. But I think she has set forth her case, and I think it is appropriate that it be in the RECORD at this time.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

The letters referred to follows:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, December 13, 1995.

Hon. ROBIN CARLE,
Clerk of the House, U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR ROBIN, As a follow-up to our meeting yesterday, I am writing to again express my grave concerns over the personnel actions you have taken over the last two weeks. I am fearful that the ability of the Office of the Clerk to perform the administrative functions of the House has been compromised. I am specifically concerned about the ability of the enrolling and tally clerks to perform their functions to their usual high standard in light of the severe staff reductions you have undertaken.

Furthermore, I and other members of the Committee on House Oversight were under the impression that your reorganization was complete. Yet these employees, who had all received and accepted offers of continued employment, have now been summarily dismissed without cause. In our recent conversation you also implied that some of these positions would be filled, some changed and some would not be filled. As you know, this is contrary to the plan you submitted to the Committee on House Oversight.

I have also been troubled to learn that contrary to my understanding from our recent conversation that you had not made any recent hires, that in fact, there are several new employees in Legislative Operations.

Since our conversation, I have had the opportunity to speak personally with a number of individuals that you or your representatives dismissed. I am shocked at the way these dismissals were handled. These dismissals all seem contrary to the policies you lay out in the Policies and Procedures manual of your office. Furthermore, many of these employees had been recently promoted and were, by your or our staff's own admission, quality employees. Again, I am very concerned that employees are now being dismissed without cause after the end of the

transition period. That was not my understanding of the protections the new majority was seeking for House employees and is contrary to all public statements made by the Majority. It is also clearly inconsistent with conversations you and I have had in the past.

In light of these recent events, I would like to see the staffing levels in each of your offices as of the following dates: November 1, 1994, January 5, 1995, July 1, 1995 and today. In addition, I now make the request to you that I have made to other officers of the House for the resumes of your senior staff, including office chiefs and of the personnel you have hired since February and the positions they occupy.

I can find no readily apparent logical or appropriate reasonable business purpose for these actions. I urge you to revisit these decisions to ensure the proper function and integrity of the Office of the Clerk, I look forward to receiving your materials and to further discussing these matters with you.

Sincerely yours,

STENY H. HOYER.

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, December 18, 1995.

Hon. STENY HOYER,
Longworth House Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN HOYER: This letter is a follow up to our conversation of Tuesday, December 12, and your letter dated December 13. I appreciate knowing of your interest in the internal management and personnel actions of my office and your concern with my personal management abilities.

First, I would like to address your questions regarding the current integrity of the Office of Legislative Operations, the Office of Legislative Computer Systems, LEGIS, the House Document Room and the overall functioning of the House floor in light of these personnel actions. It is my position, that while nine individuals were relieved of service and their responsibilities assigned to other current personnel, at no time has the integrity or quality of work produced by the Clerk's operations suffered, as evidenced by our successful performance during last week's legislative schedule. I was confident this would be the case at the time these actions were taken. Although inaccurate press accounts and hallway gossip would suggest otherwise, I believe it is now even more clearly evident to you and others that the House's ability to function did not rest solely on the shoulders of these nine individuals.

Several other rumors and issues have been circulating in light, I believe, of our earlier conversation and your subsequent conversations with other parties. Issues have been raised regarding the demographic makeup of the group of individuals hired in the last eight months, their gender and other questions regarding employees of foreign origin. In general, I have been criticized for hiring women, minorities and individuals of foreign background. I have been hiring and firing people for 20 years. It is and has always been my personal objective to hire people competent to carry out the missions required of individual positions, separate of race, gender and religious background. Not only would discrimination based upon these characteristics be in violation of House Rules and federal law, it would be against my personal beliefs and character. I am proud of my hiring record since February, which includes the appointment of 35 individuals, of whom 19 are women (54.3%), eight are minorities

(22.9%) including two individuals who hold permanent work visas and who prior to employment with my office, applied for U.S. citizenship, and two military reservists.

In addition, let me assure you that I am the employing authority for the Offices of the Clerk. I personally determine the hiring and other personnel actions that are taken in my offices. All references that either the Committee on House Oversight, Leadership Offices or others determine my personnel decisions are untrue and I find personally insulting. I made these and other personnel decisions and will not hide behind someone's political agenda to suggest otherwise. Further, I believe it is a stretch to be criticized for "wholesale" termination of individuals employed prior to the 104th Congress. After these nine actions, 168 professionals are employed by the Clerk, in addition to 66 House Page positions. Of these 168 employees, 133 are holdovers from the Democrat-controlled 103rd Congress. Therefore, 80 percent of the Clerk's current employees are holdovers from the 103rd Congress.

Also, as I explained to you earlier, in the reorganization of the Clerk's offices as I proposed to the Committee on House Oversight and as it was approved, all positions were abolished effective June 30, 1995, and new standardized positions created effective July 1, 1995. All employees who were retained within the Clerk's organization were re-assigned to these new standardized positions and this re-assignment may have resulted in increases or decreases in pay. While these nine employees were retained at that time, none of the employees received merit raises or promotions.

Between November 30 and December 7, all nine employees were informed that they were going to be placed on administrative leave from their notification date forward until January 16-22 days after Christmas and more than five weeks advance notice before their removal from the Clerk's payroll. This voluntary action was also accompanied by my further commitment to provide lump sum payments for accrued annual leave for all of these employees for up to 30 calendar days and other help in their efforts to find alternative employment. No employee was terminated during the Christmas Holiday week as stated throughout various media reports.

Other media reports have contained statements that the released employees were "locked out" of computers prior to their notification. This statement is completely inaccurate. While changes in computer user IDs and passwords have now occurred, it came after notification of individuals of their future employment status. In fact, all employees were asked during their exit interview with the Immediate Office to complete a checkout process with my office prior to close of business Monday, December 11. This process is routine and requires the return of office keys, House equipment, parking stickers and House IDs prior to the finalization of payroll actions. A number of these released individuals have failed to meet this deadline and could jeopardize timely processing of their lump sum payments during this compressed administrative period. Any personal assistance you could provide in the retrieval of these items would be of great help.

I'd like to again state that while all these positions were contained within my reorganization proposal adopted by the Committee on House Oversight and implemented on July 1, 1995, I have yet to determine whether to fill these positions with new candidates, hold them as vacant positions or forward a proposal to CHO for their elimination.

You also raise questions regarding the personnel manual I have provided my staff on the operation of the Offices of the Clerk. The

manual clearly outlines procedures and guidelines for disciplinary actions and dismissals for cause. In no way does the manual prohibit dismissal without cause or end the category of at-will employment. In fact, contrary to various media reports, the enactment and implementation of the Congressional Accountability Act will not end at-will employment in these offices.

I know and respect your interest in the institutional aspects of Capitol Hill. Like you, I have a deep sense of obligation and responsibility to ensure the success of the House and in particular the Clerk's organization. Consequently, I have never had any interest in taking internal administrative actions that would threaten the abilities of the House. I would like to personally discuss with you again any questions or concerns you have regarding these actions and my management abilities.

Finally, I share your belief that these individuals have and could continue, in different capacities, to make positive contributions to the House. While I do not wish to further their employment with the Clerk's organization, I am not the only employing authority on Capitol Hill. I would happily recommend them for employment with you or any other Member interested in offering them new opportunities.

If you have any further inquiries, I would welcome them.

With warm regards,

ROBIN H. CARLE.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to emphasize briefly in the letter to Mr. HOYER the Clerk indicated, "These positions were contained within my reorganization proposal adopted by the Committee on House Oversight and implemented on July 1, 1995." The Clerk says, "I have yet to determine whether to fill these positions with new candidates, hold them as vacant positions, or forward a proposal to the Committee on House Oversight for their elimination."

Again, this is a business reorganization decision on the part of the Clerk.

She goes on to say, "You have also raised questions regarding the personnel manual I have provided my staff on the operation of the offices of the Clerk." The letter states, "The manual clearly outlines procedures and guidelines for disciplinary actions and dismissals for cause. In no way does the manual prohibit dismissal without cause or in the category of at-will employment. In fact, contrary to various media reports, the enactment and implementation of the Congressional Accountability Act will not end at-will employment in these offices."

Mr. Speaker, I would to on to tell you that it will not end the reorganization of this institution, and that there will be individuals who will no longer have jobs, through no fault of their own, other than the fact that this place was padded with scores of people who should never have been on the payroll in the first place, and who had jobs which did not make a lot of sense. We will continue to restructure this place until it makes sense. We will do it with as much reasonableness as we can, but we will do it.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the letter di-

rected to Ms. Carle dated December 13, 1995, appear immediately preceding her response, so that the record is clear.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. THOMAS] that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, House Resolution 311.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 122, REVISED BUDGET RESOLUTION REFLECTING THE PRESIDENT'S MOST RECENT PROPOSAL

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 309 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 309

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order without intervention of any point of order to consider in the House the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 122) setting forth a revised congressional budget for the United States Government for the fiscal years 1996, 1997, 1998, 1999, 2000, 2001, and 2002. The concurrent resolution shall be debatable for two hours equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Budget. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the concurrent resolution to final adoption without intervening motion or demand for division of the question.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, for the purposes of debate only, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MOAKLEY], pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of the resolution, all time yielded is for debate purposes only.

(Mr. SOLOMON asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material.)

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 309 is a closed rule providing for consideration in the House of House Concurrent Resolution 122, a revised budget resolution for fiscal years 1996 through 2002. The resolution is based on the Congressional Budget Office scoring of the most recent budget proposal of the President as laid before the Congress last Friday, December 15. The rule provides for 2 hours of general debate, equally divided between the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Budget.

□ 1230

The rule provides that the previous question is ordered to final adoption without intervening motion.

Now, Members, what that means is that there will not be a motion to recommit. That is consistent with the existing provision of the Budget Act, which prohibits recommitting a budget resolution.

Mr. Speaker, and as Members will recall, last spring I wrote to the President and offered him the opportunity to present to us an alternative 7-year balanced budget that we could make in order during consideration of the congressional budget resolution, along with other alternatives we would bring to the floor for debate. If Members will recall, all of those resolutions were balanced budgets that were brought to the floor.

At that time, we received no response from the President. By its lack of response to my request, the administration was, in my opinion, indicating that it was not interested in even trying to achieve a balanced budget within 7 years or within any other time.

Mr. Speaker, the President subsequently, later on, suggested that it might be possible to offer a balanced budget in 10 years, then maybe in 9 years, he said, then 8 years, and, finally, only recently, maybe he could do it in 7 years.

But, still, unfortunately, the President has not been willing to use Congressional Budget Office estimates as required, and this is so important for the press and for Members back in their offices, he was not willing to use Congressional Budget Office estimates as required by the law and signed by President Clinton himself as part of the continuing appropriations resolution.

Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this rule today is to give the House an opportunity to decide whether it wants to proceed with the President's 7-year budget that is not in balance. Let me repeat that. To proceed with the President's 7-year budget that he has given us last Friday, December 15, that is not in balance, according to CBO. That is the Congressional Budget Office.

What that budget shows, when we factor in all the off-budget items, is that the President is still some \$87 billion in deficit after 7 years, compared to \$3 billion in surplus in the Balanced Budget Act recently passed by this Congress, that means both Houses, and sent to the President, and which he vetoed that bill.

Mr. Speaker, a commitment was made by both the President and the Congress to enact a 7-year balanced budget using nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office estimates and to do so this year. There is no question about the meaning or requirements of that language that both branches have committed to by law; that the President has committed to by law. But the administration has, thus far, refused to agree to CBO estimates in bringing

their budget request into balance by fiscal year 2002.

Yesterday, the House overwhelmingly reaffirmed, by a vote of 351 to 40, its commitment to the 7-year, CBO-scored balanced budget. Today, the House will have an opportunity to decide the same question from a different angle. Today's resolution will give this House a straight up or down vote on the President's \$87 billion deficit in fiscal year 2002. That is what this vote will be all about here today on this floor.

If the House agrees that we should accept the President's priorities and estimates, then we will proceed with budget negotiations based on those assumptions. That means the President's assumptions and the President's priorities.

If the House decides to, however, stick to its guns and stick by the law, incidentally that we enacted, that says we really do want to balance the budget in 7 years, scored by the nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office, then we can, hopefully, get back to the negotiating table with that clear statement of our intent. Again, that is what that vote is all about on this floor today.

Mr. Speaker, we cannot proceed to negotiate from different tables. Either we are at the CBO table or the OMB table. But the people want us to sit down again at the same table, and they want us to make sure that that table is on the level and that everything is on the level and on the table. That is what this is all about. That is what we are asking today.

Mr. Speaker, I know it is sometimes difficult for the American people to follow all this talk about CBO and OMB. They have trouble even understanding what that is all about. It is more beltway talk or alphabet soup than anything else. But what they may recall, Mr. Speaker, is that the President, and Members should listen to this because it is so important, the President declared in 1993, in his first State of the Union Address, and I have it over here for Members if they want to see the actual quotations, the President said in his first State of the Union Address that we should use the more reliable numbers of the Congressional Budget Office in scoring his budget in that year. That was this President Clinton that said that.

In that address on February 17, 1993, the President asked this Congress to score his budget using, and I quote, "the independent numbers of the Congressional Budget Office." And he went on to say, and this is a continuation of his quote, "I will point out that the Congressional Budget Office was normally more conservative in what was going to happen and closer to the right than previous Presidents have been."

What could be more simple and honest than that admission? Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I was just shocked, I was aghast to hear on Sunday's TV talk show the President's Chief of Staff, Mr. Panetta, and he is a former chairman

of this House Committee on the Budget and former Director of the Office of Management and Budget, and he tried to wiggle out of the commitment to use CBO economic estimates in scoring the President's budget proposals as required, again, by law. It is the law that we do that.

Instead, what he proposed was that somehow we should begin without using anybody's assumptions; we should proceed to negotiate a budget agreement; and then, and only then, score the agreement by some kind of negotiated compromise between CBO and OMB. That is smoke and mirrors at its worst.

Mr. Speaker, that is the most mind-boggling, mind-blowing, mind-bending suggestion that I have ever heard coming out of someone with the experience of Mr. Panetta.

The President of the United States is talking about compromising the integrity of the independent Congressional Budget Office, formerly touted by that President, which I just read my colleagues, in saying that economic projections should be a matter of political negotiations after the fact.

Members of the House, the President is coming across like the 300-pound man who has promised his wife he will lose 100 pounds by the end of the year. But when it comes to the end of the year, and he has only lost 25 pounds, he asks his wife to renegotiate the meaning of the 100 pounds so that it conforms to the 25 pounds he actually lost. That is how ridiculous this whole argument is. It is outrageous.

Mr. Speaker, I do not think the question of a real balanced budget should be a matter that is subject to negotiation just to conform to the appetites of government and those that want to spend, spend, spend. It should, instead, conform to the American taxpayers' pocketbook, as we would like to see it, and that is in balance.

Mr. Speaker, just as a rose, is a rose, is a rose, a balanced budget, is a balanced budget, is a balanced budget. And just as a rose by any other name would still smell as sweet, an unbalanced budget by any other name would still smell rotten.

Members, is it any wonder that the American people are so fed up and holding their noses over the smells emanating from this President's attempt to portray an unbalanced budget as balanced? What could be more transparent than a gilded rose that still smells like a skunk cabbage? And do Members know what a skunk cabbage is? My friends, try smelling one one time.

Mr. Speaker, the charge was made in the Committee on Rules that this rule and this budget resolution it makes in order is political. Well, Mr. Speaker, I would simply point out that we are now engaged in the political process, in a political body that is the Congress, under a political system that is established by our Constitution. Politics is about the allocation of resources,

about setting priorities, making choices. That is what this Congress is all about.

Yes, this is politics in the most honorable and defining sense of that term. We are indeed engaged in the most important political debate of our generation, over whether we are willing to put our political and financial House in order by living within our means. That is something the American people do. They expect us to do it.

This debate will define for the next generation whether we were willing to face up to that challenge of balancing the budget and providing a brighter future for our children and our grandchildren, and I have four of them, or whether we will be too cowardly to do

that and, instead, consign these people, these children of ours, and our posterity to deeper debt, stagnation and failure. We just cannot do that.

This is about politics in its finest sense of that term, the politics of making tough, hard choices. That is what we have to do if we are to balance the budget, but they are choices that will determine the future direction of this Nation and what kind of legacy we will leave to our posterity.

I urge support of this rule and defeat of the President's unbalanced budget that will be on this floor in just a few minutes so that we can get back on the course we and the President, by law, committed to, and that is achieving a truly balanced budget in the next 7

years; and getting back to a common negotiating table that is on the level with everything on it. That is what this is all about.

Mr. Speaker, Members should come over here, vote for this rule, and then defeat this unbalanced budget so that we can get on with what we have all agreed to, and that is bringing some fiscal sanity to this Government of ours.

Mr. Speaker, I include for the RECORD, a document entitled "The Amendment Process Under Special Rules Reported By The Rules Committee, 103rd Congress v. 104th Congress (As of December 18, 1995)."

THE AMENDMENT PROCESS UNDER SPECIAL RULES REPORTED BY THE RULES COMMITTEE,¹ 103D CONGRESS V. 104TH CONGRESS

[As of December 19, 1995]

Rule type	103d Congress		104th Congress	
	Number of rules	Percent of total	Number of rules	Percent of total
Open/Modified-open ²	46	44	57	65
Modified Closed ³	49	47	20	23
Closed ⁴	9	9	11	12
Total	104	100	88	100

¹ This table applies only to rules which provide for the original consideration of bills, joint resolutions or budget resolutions and which provide for an amendment process. It does not apply to special rules which only waive points of order against appropriations bills which are already privileged and are considered under an open amendment process under House rules.

² An open rule is one under which any Member may offer a germane amendment under the five-minute rule. A modified open rule is one under which any Member may offer a germane amendment under the five-minute rule subject only to an overall time limit on the amendment process and/or a requirement that the amendment be preprinted in the Congressional Record.

³ A modified closed rule is one under which the Rules Committee limits the amendments that may be offered only to those amendments designated in the special rule or the Rules Committee report to accompany it, or which preclude amendments to a particular portion of a bill, even though the rest of the bill may be completely open to amendment.

⁴ A closed rule is one under which no amendments may be offered (other than amendments recommended by the committee in reporting the bill).

SPECIAL RULES REPORTED BY THE RULES COMMITTEE, 104TH CONGRESS

[As of December 19, 1995]

H. Res. No. (Date rept.)	Rule type	Bill No.	Subject	Disposition of rule
H. Res. 38 (1/18/95)	O	H.R. 5	Unfunded Mandate Reform	A: 350-71 (1/19/95).
H. Res. 44 (1/24/95)	MC	H. Con. Res. 17	Social Security	A: 255-172 (1/25/95).
		H.J. Res. 1	Balanced Budget Amdt	
H. Res. 51 (1/31/95)	O	H.R. 101	Land Transfer, Taos Pueblo Indians	A: voice vote (2/1/95).
H. Res. 52 (1/31/95)	O	H.R. 400	Land Exchange, Arctic Nat'l Park and Preserve	A: voice vote (2/1/95).
H. Res. 53 (1/31/95)	O	H.R. 440	Land Conveyance, Butte County, Calif	A: voice vote (2/1/95).
H. Res. 55 (2/1/95)	O	H.R. 2	Line Item Veto	A: voice vote (2/2/95).
H. Res. 60 (2/6/95)	O	H.R. 665	Victim Restitution	A: voice vote (2/7/95).
H. Res. 61 (2/6/95)	O	H.R. 666	Exclusionary Rule Reform	A: voice vote (2/7/95).
H. Res. 63 (2/8/95)	MO	H.R. 667	Violent Criminal Incarceration	A: voice vote (2/9/95).
H. Res. 69 (2/9/95)	O	H.R. 668	Criminal Alien Deportation	A: voice vote (2/10/95).
H. Res. 79 (2/10/95)	MO	H.R. 728	Law Enforcement Block Grants	A: voice vote (2/13/95).
H. Res. 83 (2/13/95)	MO	H.R. 7	National Security Revitalization	PO: 229-100; A: 227-127 (2/15/95).
H. Res. 88 (2/16/95)	MC	H.R. 831	Health Insurance Deductibility	PO: 230-191; A: 229-188 (2/21/95).
H. Res. 91 (2/21/95)	O	H.R. 830	Paperwork Reduction Act	A: voice vote (2/22/95).
H. Res. 92 (2/21/95)	MC	H.R. 889	Defense Supplemental	A: 282-144 (2/22/95).
H. Res. 93 (2/22/95)	MO	H.R. 450	Regulatory Transition Act	A: 252-175 (2/23/95).
H. Res. 96 (2/24/95)	MO	H.R. 1022	Risk Assessment	A: 253-165 (2/27/95).
H. Res. 100 (2/27/95)	O	H.R. 926	Regulatory Reform and Relief Act	A: voice vote (2/28/95).
H. Res. 101 (2/28/95)	MO	H.R. 925	Private Property Protection Act	A: 271-151 (3/2/95).
H. Res. 103 (3/3/95)	MO	H.R. 1058	Securities Litigation Reform	
H. Res. 104 (3/3/95)	MO	H.R. 988	Attorney Accountability Act	
H. Res. 105 (3/6/95)	MO			A: voice vote (3/6/95).
H. Res. 108 (3/7/95)	Debate	H.R. 956	Product Liability Reform	A: 257-155 (3/7/95).
H. Res. 109 (3/8/95)	MC			A: voice vote (3/8/95).
H. Res. 115 (3/14/95)	MO	H.R. 1159	Making Emergency Supp. Approps	PO: 234-191; A: 247-181 (3/9/95).
H. Res. 116 (3/15/95)	MC	H.J. Res. 73	Term Limits Const. Amdt	A: 242-190 (3/15/95).
H. Res. 117 (3/16/95)	Debate	H.R. 4	Personal Responsibility Act of 1995	A: voice vote (3/28/95).
H. Res. 119 (3/21/95)	MC			A: voice vote (3/21/95).
H. Res. 125 (4/3/95)	O	H.R. 1271	Family Privacy Protection Act	A: 217-211 (3/22/95).
H. Res. 126 (4/3/95)	O	H.R. 660	Older Persons Housing Act	A: 423-1 (4/4/95).
H. Res. 128 (4/4/95)	MC	H.R. 1215	Contract With America Tax Relief Act of 1995	A: voice vote (4/6/95).
H. Res. 130 (4/5/95)	MC	H.R. 483	Medicare Select Expansion	A: 228-204 (4/5/95).
H. Res. 136 (5/1/95)	O	H.R. 655	Hydrogen Future Act of 1995	A: 253-172 (4/6/95).
H. Res. 139 (5/3/95)	O	H.R. 1361	Coast Guard Auth. FY 1996	A: voice vote (5/2/95).
H. Res. 140 (5/9/95)	O	H.R. 961	Clean Water Amendments	A: voice vote (5/9/95).
H. Res. 144 (5/11/95)	O	H.R. 535	Fish Hatchery—Arkansas	A: 414-4 (5/10/95).
H. Res. 145 (5/11/95)	O	H.R. 584	Fish Hatchery—Iowa	A: voice vote (5/15/95).
H. Res. 146 (5/11/95)	O	H.R. 614	Fish Hatchery—Minnesota	A: voice vote (5/15/95).
H. Res. 149 (5/16/95)	MC	H. Con. Res. 67	Budget Resolution FY 1996	PO: 252-170; A: 255-168 (5/17/95).
H. Res. 155 (5/22/95)	MO	H.R. 1561	American Overseas Interests Act	A: 233-176 (5/23/95).
H. Res. 164 (6/8/95)	MC	H.R. 1530	Nat. Defense Auth. FY 1996	PO: 225-191; A: 233-183 (6/13/95).
H. Res. 167 (6/15/95)	O	H.R. 1817	MilCon Appropriations FY 1996	PO: 223-180; A: 245-155 (6/16/95).
H. Res. 169 (6/19/95)	MC	H.R. 1854	Leg. Branch Approps. FY 1996	PO: 232-196; A: 236-191 (6/20/95).
H. Res. 170 (6/20/95)	O	H.R. 1868	For. Ops. Approps. FY 1996	PO: 221-178; A: 217-175 (6/22/95).
H. Res. 171 (6/22/95)	O	H.R. 1905	Energy & Water Approps. FY 1996	A: voice vote (7/12/95).
H. Res. 173 (6/27/95)	C	H.J. Res. 79	Flag Constitutional Amendment	PO: 258-170; A: 271-152 (6/28/95).
H. Res. 176 (6/28/95)	MC	H.R. 1944	Emer. Supp. Approps	PO: 236-194; A: 234-192 (6/29/95).
H. Res. 185 (7/11/95)	O	H.R. 1977	Interior Approps. FY 1996	PO: 235-193; D: 192-238 (7/12/95).
H. Res. 187 (7/12/95)	O	H.R. 1977	Interior Approps. FY 1996 #2	PO: 230-194; A: 229-195 (7/13/95).
H. Res. 188 (7/12/95)	O	H.R. 1976	Agriculture Approps. FY 1996	PO: 242-185; A: voice vote (7/18/95).
H. Res. 190 (7/17/95)	O	H.R. 2020	Treasury/Postal Approps. FY 1996	PO: 232-192; A: voice vote (7/18/95).
H. Res. 193 (7/19/95)	C	H.J. Res. 96	Disapproval of MFN to China	A: voice vote (7/20/95).
H. Res. 194 (7/19/95)	O	H.R. 2002	Transportation Approps. FY 1996	PO: 217-202 (7/21/95).
H. Res. 197 (7/21/95)	O	H.R. 70	Exports of Alaskan Crude Oil	A: voice vote (7/24/95).
H. Res. 198 (7/21/95)	O	H.R. 2076	Commerce, State Approps. FY 1996	A: voice vote (7/25/95).
H. Res. 201 (7/25/95)	O	H.R. 2099	VA/HUD Approps. FY 1996	A: 230-189 (7/25/95).
H. Res. 204 (7/28/95)	MC	S. 21	Terminating U.S. Arms Embargo on Bosnia	A: voice vote (8/1/95).
H. Res. 205 (7/28/95)	O	H.R. 2126	Defense Approps. FY 1996	A: 409-1 (7/31/95).

SPECIAL RULES REPORTED BY THE RULES COMMITTEE, 104TH CONGRESS—Continued

[As of December 19, 1995]

H. Res. No. (Date rept.)	Rule type	Bill No.	Subject	Disposition of rule
H. Res. 207 (8/1/95)	MC	H.R. 1555	Communications Act of 1995	A: 255-156 (8/2/95).
H. Res. 208 (8/1/95)	O	H.R. 2127	Labor, HHS Approps. FY 1996	A: 323-104 (8/2/95).
H. Res. 215 (9/7/95)	O	H.R. 1594	Economically Targeted Investments	A: voice vote (9/12/95).
H. Res. 216 (9/7/95)	MO	H.R. 1655	Intelligence Authorization FY 1996	A: voice vote (9/12/95).
H. Res. 218 (9/12/95)	O	H.R. 1162	Deficit Reduction Lockbox	A: voice vote (9/13/95).
H. Res. 219 (9/12/95)	O	H.R. 1670	Federal Acquisition Reform Act	A: 414-0 (9/13/95).
H. Res. 222 (9/18/95)	O	H.R. 1617	CAREERS Act	A: 388-2 (9/19/95).
H. Res. 224 (9/19/95)	O	H.R. 2274	Natl. Highway System	PQ: 241-173 A: 375-39-1 (9/20/95).
H. Res. 225 (9/19/95)	MC	H.R. 927	Cuban Liberty & Dem. Solidarity	A: 304-118 (9/20/95).
H. Res. 226 (9/21/95)	O	H.R. 743	Team Act	A: 344-66-1 (9/27/95).
H. Res. 227 (9/21/95)	O	H.R. 1170	3-Judge Court	A: voice vote (9/28/95).
H. Res. 228 (9/21/95)	O	H.R. 1601	Internatl. Space Station	A: voice vote (9/27/95).
H. Res. 230 (9/27/95)	C	H.J. Res. 108	Continuing Resolution FY 1996	A: voice vote (9/28/95).
H. Res. 234 (9/29/95)	O	H.R. 2405	Omnibus Science Auth.	A: voice vote (10/11/95).
H. Res. 237 (10/17/95)	MC	H.R. 2259	Disapprove Sentencing Guidelines	A: voice vote (10/18/95).
H. Res. 238 (10/18/95)	MC	H.R. 2425	Medicare Preservation Act	PQ: 231-194 A: 227-192 (10/19/95).
H. Res. 239 (10/19/95)	C	H.R. 2492	Leg. Branch Approps	PQ: 235-184 A: voice vote (10/31/95).
H. Res. 245 (10/25/95)	MC	H. Con. Res. 109	Social Security Earnings Reform	PQ: 228-191 A: 235-185 (10/26/95).
		H.R. 2491	Seven-Year Balanced Budget	
H. Res. 251 (10/31/95)	C	H.R. 1833	Partial Birth Abortion Ban	A: 237-190 (11/1/95).
H. Res. 252 (10/31/95)	MO	H.R. 2546	D.C. Approps.	A: 241-181 (11/1/95).
H. Res. 257 (11/7/95)	C	H.J. Res. 115	Cont. Res. FY 1996	A: 216-210 (11/8/95).
H. Res. 258 (11/8/95)	MC	H.R. 2586	Debt Limit	A: 220-200 (11/10/95).
H. Res. 259 (11/9/95)	O	H.R. 2539	ICC Termination Act	A: voice vote (11/14/95).
H. Res. 261 (11/9/95)	C	H.J. Res. 115	Cont. Resolution	A: 223-182 (11/10/95).
H. Res. 262 (11/9/95)	C	H.R. 2586	Increase Debt Limit	A: 220-185 (11/10/95).
H. Res. 269 (11/15/95)	O	H.R. 2564	Lobbying Reform	A: voice vote (11/16/95).
H. Res. 270 (11/15/95)	C	H.J. Res. 122	Further Cont. Resolution	A: 229-176 (11/15/95).
H. Res. 273 (11/16/95)	MC	H.R. 2606	Prohibition on Funds for Bosnia	A: 239-181 (11/17/95).
H. Res. 284 (11/29/95)	O	H.R. 1788	Amtrak Reform	A: voice vote (11/30/95).
H. Res. 287 (11/30/95)	O	H.R. 1350	Maritime Security Act	A: voice vote (12/6/95).
H. Res. 293 (12/7/95)	C	H.R. 2621	Protect Federal Trust Funds	PQ: 223-183 A: 228-184 (12/14/95).
H. Res. 303 (12/13/95)	O	H.R. 1745	Utah Public Lands	
H. Res. 309 (12/18/95)	C	H. Con. Res. 122	Budget Res. W/President.	

Codes: O=open rule; MO=modified open rule; MC=modified closed rule; C=closed rule; A=adoption vote; D=defeated; PQ=previous question vote. Source: Notices of Action Taken, Committee on Rules, 104th Congress.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume. Mr. Speaker, the truth is this is not even the President's budget. It was put together by a Republican staff without consulting the White House and without consulting OMB. So let us get that matter straight.

Mr. Speaker, once again, the House of Representatives is spending time on a matter that is a complete waste of time. Today is the 10th day this year that the U.S. Government has been closed.

Today 383,000 people will be turned away from National Park Service facilities. Today 80,000 people will be turned away from the Smithsonian Institutions and the National Zoo. Today the January 1 benefit checks for 3.3 million veterans will be threatened. Today 20,000 students who apply for loans will not have their applications processed, and may not be able to pay for college.

Mr. Speaker, my Republican colleagues have been in control of the Congress for almost a year.

On October 1, 10 months into their reign, the Republican Congress should have finished the 13 appropriations bills so that the Federal Government wouldn't shut down and these things wouldn't happen.

So, Mr. Speaker, here we are. It's nearly Christmas and we haven't even sent all the appropriations bills to the President yet. The American people will feel it.

That's why my Republican colleagues are negotiating with the President today. That's why it's so important to keep those negotiations open instead of playing these type of political games.

This bill today is just an attempt to embarrass the President, and it is a

waste of time; and, so I said, it is a waste of time.

Last week my Republican colleagues dismissed this proposal out of hand. They refuse to reconsider their own Medicare and Medicaid cuts to pay for tax breaks for the rich. They refuse to keep their end of the contract and propose a budget that protects Medicare, education, and the environment.

So why on Earth is this out-of-date negotiating offer on the floor now? and why haven't my Republican colleagues put together their own alternative?

If Congress and the President are in the midst of negotiating then negotiate. Keep going until you get it right. The American people are getting tired of these silly political games, and I just don't blame them.

Mr. Speaker let's get a deal the House can vote on, or at least let's get the appropriations bills on the floor. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to defeat this rule. The resolution is a waste of time, and Congress shouldn't be playing these games. Let's stop the politics and give the American people their Government back.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1245

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I will be glad to respond to the gentleman's remark, in my closing remarks.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Claremont, CA [Mr. DREIER], one of the outstanding Members of this body, and a member of the Committee on Rules.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend from Glens Falls, the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Rules, for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to strong support of this rule, believing that we should, in fact, keep out promises. That is really what this comes down to, very simply and basically, Mr. Speaker.

We made a commitment on September 27, 1994, that we would move ahead with the Contract With America. Within that plan, we called for balancing the Federal budget. We all read the newspaper. We watch television. We know that there is a very low level of support right now for Republicans in the U.S. Congress. But guess what? To a Member, we have found on our side of the aisle a very strong commitment to the promise that was made. That commitment is to balance the Federal budget within 7 years.

Mr. Speaker, I have been criticized for this in the past. I am going to say it again. I want to help Bill Clinton become a better President. The gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] has ridden me for saying that, and several others have.

Do my colleagues know why I want to make Bill Clinton a better President? Because he is our Commander in Chief and we only have one President at a time. I believe that we can make him a better President by helping him keep the promises that he made back in 1992 when he was a candidate.

He said that he would balance the budget within 5 years. Just a few months after he won that election, he stood right here, as the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] has said, and he said on February 17, 1993, in his state of the union message, that he wanted us to use the reliable Congressional Budget Office scoring procedure.

Mr. Speaker, he has also said time and time again that he wants to reduce the size and scope of Government. He does not want to make cuts in Medicare and Medicaid. Mr. Speaker, we are doing every single one of those things. But unfortunately, unfortunately, the President is going down the road toward further deficit spending.

He is claiming that we are cutting Medicare and Medicaid when, in fact,

we all know we are bringing about a 63-percent increase in the level of spending for Medicare over the next 7 years and we are dramatically increasing Medicaid and allowing the States to have the opportunity to establish their priorities.

Unfortunately, as we look at where we are headed, the President's plan calls for deficits as far as the eye can see, and as the gentleman from New York said, \$87 billion in the year 2002.

Mr. Speaker, one of the things that has not been talked about much as been the fact that we are putting into place an economic growth package here. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MOAKLEY], my pal from south Boston, talked about tax breaks for the rich, when in fact he knows, and even President Clinton acknowledges, that if we were to reduce the top rate on capital gains we could stimulate economic growth.

Mr. Speaker, we also know that an overwhelming majority of the benefits for reducing the top rate on capital gains goes toward working Americans. Many of the people who are categorized as rich have a low level of income the year before they take their appreciated asset; that small business, or their home, and realize it. And the year after, they are also making \$30,000 or \$40,000 a year. But the 1 year they look at this asset, they are categorized as the rich, when in fact they are working Americans who have simply been aspiring to attain the American dream: The success of a business, owning a home, and the chance to pass on to their children and grandchildren some of the benefits of their very hard work.

Mr. Speaker, if we were to reduce the top rate on capital gains, it is not a drain on the Treasury. Every single time in the history of this country that we have seen the top rate on capital gains reduced, we have seen economic growth and, yes, an increase in the flow of revenues to the Federal Treasury.

In fact, if we were to have a 15 percent rate on capital gains, we would, over a 7-year period, see an increase of \$200 billion in revenues to the Federal Treasury.

This is a very balanced package. We should support this rule, and move forward and, in fact, defeat the President's budget. We all know that it is smoke and mirrors and it is really an abrogation of the responsibility the President was given when he was elected in 1992.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY], ranking minority member on the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I hope that no one here thinks that anything real is going on, because it is not and that is a disgrace. It is a downright shame.

Mr. Speaker, as everyone knows, the President and the Republican leadership in the Congress have a "slightly" different view about what budget prior-

ities ought to be, about what tax priorities ought to be, and they have reached an impasse, apparently.

So, to try to gain more brownie points politically, what is now happening is that the Republican leadership of the House is bringing a bill to the floor which they pretend is the President's budget.

Mr. Speaker, it is not the President's budget. It is their own concoction, their own political concoction designed to create another vehicle by which they can rhetorically beat up on the President for a couple of hours, rather than sitting down seriously and talking about real program differences on budget negotiations.

Mr. Speaker, they also are planning later today, apparently, at least they have been, to bring up a continuing resolution to allow the Government of the District of Columbia to proceed, but not to allow the Federal Government to reopen. I also find that position ludicrous and unreal.

What we need to have happen here is for the political rhetoric to stop. What we need to have happen is for the Republican leadership of the Congress to sit down and negotiate with the President with no preconditions. What we need is for all of us to stop attacking each other rhetorically because we are not about to do anything real.

Mr. Speaker, we ought to be doing something that is real. What we ought to be doing is to try to find ways to bridge differences, not to find rhetorical arguments that will expand those differences. Why should we have a closed rule on this budget to allow only this so-called President's budget to come up, when it is not even the President's budget? He is not even asking that you do it. Why should the coalition budget not be up? Why should a number of other options not be up on the floor?

All this is is a narrow political exercise that substitutes rhetoric for real action. What has happened in plain view is that the majority party has taken so much heat in the polls for their budgets which have squashed Medicare, squashed Medicaid, squashed education, that they are trying to divert attention from that.

To do that, first of all they engineer an unneeded Government shutdown, an artificially created crisis, and then they bring this joke to the floor. They should be ashamed of themselves. We have better things to do with our time than this dog and pony act.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 15 seconds just to say to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY], the Committee on the Budget made a request to the Office of Management and Budget to bring their figures, to bring their budget here. They flatly refused to do it. The only way we could smoke out the President's budget is to take what he has been saying through the media.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Sanibel,

FL [Mr. GOSS], a member of the Committee on Rules.

(Mr. GOSS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Glens Falls, NY [Mr. SOLOMON], my friend, the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Rules, for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the rule, but in strong opposition to the underlying resolution.

Some may wonder why we are taking the time to debate this budget resolution, when it so clearly does not meet the simple test that the President signed into law just last month: A balanced budget in 2002. The reason is that people need to know the President is unwilling to come to the table with a real balanced budget proposal. It seems the only way to get through the spin zone at the White House is to force the issue—put his numbers up to the test and watch the plan fall of its own weight.

Once a majority of this House rejects the President's cooked-book numbers then maybe the President will drop his pretenses and come to the table in good faith. We've given him four chances to meet this goal: His first two budgets, including his first so-called balanced budget would have resulted in \$200 billion in deficits in 2002, according to CBO. The President's third and fourth budgets—submitted after he signed into law a commitment to achieve a balanced budget in 7 years—still come up short by some \$87 billion in the final year. This is absolutely unacceptable—to the American people, and to a bipartisan majority of this House.

Yesterday the House of Representatives voted overwhelmingly in favor of balancing the budget in 7 years using real numbers: 351 Members, including a majority of the Democratic Party recognize the overwhelming need to balance the budget.

Mr. Speaker, the time has come for the President to realize that he cannot have it both ways—he must come to the table in good faith, or put at risk the future of not just our children, but—according to the bipartisan commission on entitlement and tax reform—our entire Federal safety net. I am disappointed that we have come to this exposé today, but it must be done. Support the rule; vote down the President's unbalanced budget and invite him to work realistically on accomplishing balance by 2002. Let's do what we must before 1996 arrives.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 6 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. VOLKMER].

(Mr. VOLKMER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. VOLKMER. Mr. Speaker, well, we have got a big joke here today. We have got a bunch of adults acting as children. I can remember back when I was a youngster and the circus would come to town, Ringling Brothers/Barnum & Bailey. That was the "Greatest

Show on Earth." Well, Mr. Speaker, this is the greatest show on Earth today.

It is unbelievable that we would have grown people playing games that are being played here today, knowing that the resolution that they are going to offer is not the President's budget; it is one that they made up, what they say is based on what the President proposed way back when, not today, and they are playing games. They are trying to fool the public.

Mr. Speaker, it is really just a plain old show. That is all it is, with no real purpose as far as legislators are concerned.

Mr. Speaker, I have been a legislator in the State legislature and in this Congress for 29 years. I have never, in my history, ever seen an act like this. We do not see an act this good on Broadway. I do not know why we do not sell tickets for this big show, because that is all it is.

Who is the ringmaster? Well, the Speaker is. There is no question in my mind. The Speaker has divined that this is the greatest show, and we have seen the shows that the Speaker has presented in the past.

So come one, come all. Come and visit the show, because that is all it is. At the end, this whole proposal will not hardly get a vote, if one, in this whole Congress.

So what is the purpose? The whole purpose? The purpose is they want a show. What it is is all part of a game. It is all part of the game that started not just yesterday, not a week ago, not a month ago. This game started way back in the spring when the majority decided that they were not going to pass the appropriation bills in time for September 30, so the Government would run, because they wanted to use the shutdown of the Government in order to force the President and the Democrats to accept their budget.

Mr. Speaker, one has nothing to do with the other. Appropriation bills are separate bills that should have been passed, but they did not want to. They decided that they could force the President, in order to not shut down the Government.

Mr. Speaker, I say to the President, "Mr. President, I want to tell you, and I want to tell this House, you stand firm for your principles. I will stay with you right to the end."

When is the end? Maybe sometime next year when these people finally realize on the other side of the aisle what they have done not only to Government employees, but what they have done unmercifully, mean-spirited, radical, revolution to this country, this great country of ours.

Mr. Speaker, they say they are patriots. They are not patriots when they are willing to shut down Wall Street; when they are willing to shut down the bond market. They are not patriots when they are willing to tell investors that their money is not worth anything when they get down to the bond mar-

ket, because we could very well get there on the road we are going and the attitude that has been taken by the majority.

□ 1300

How long, Mr. President, I say, Mr. President, you stand with your principles as long as it takes until the majority realizes that you are not going to cave in to their blackmail. That is all it is, pure blackmail, pure threats. Do not cave in. I ask my Democratic friends not to cave in. Stand firm. Stand firm for our principles. If they want to ruin the country, let them ruin the country.

I would like to say one other thing. At the time that I was off from here and when my wife was ill, I used to watch the news. I did not have time to play silly games. I listened to people like Tom Brokaw and Peter Jennings and Dan Rather, read the Washington Post, Wall Street Journal, and other newsworthy newspapers.

Not one of those people know what is really going on here in this House, not a one of them. They are ignorant. I never saw such major commentators in the media with such major influence in this country, that do not realize what the majority, under NEWT GINGRICH, is planning to do to this country in order to try to force the President and the Democrat Members to accept their priorities and what they believe in.

They do not believe in compromise. The Speaker has said there is no compromise. Ask any one of them to take the tax cuts out of the bill, ask them. They will not do it. They could have a balanced budget in 7 years if they just take their tax cuts out. That is all they have to do. Then we can work through the rest of it.

Members have seen a budget. We voted on it in this House, the coalition budget. That was the best budget that has ever been offered to either one of these bodies. Yet the Republican Members say "no," they will not take it because it does not have that tax cut for the rich.

Well, folks that tells you something. It is a tax cut for the rich that they are after.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Utah [Mr. ORTON].

(Mr. ORTON asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ORTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this rule and urge my colleagues to defeat the previous question so that in fact we could bring the coalition budget to the floor of the House for debate. Obviously the parties do not wish to negotiate in what is supposed to be taking place in negotiations between the House and Senate leadership and the President. It appears that they wish to negotiate the budget here on the floor of the House by bringing this particular resolution. If we are going to do that, then bring the coalition budget to the floor and

let us present it also. If we are going to negotiate here, bring all of the options to the floor of the House under an open rule without time limits and let us, all of us, stay right here in this House without recessing, without closing the doors until we battle it out and come to an agreement.

If that is what my colleagues want to do here on the floor, then open it up and let us do it. But to bring this kind of a closed rule forward, all it is is lobbying hand grenades back and forth between the Hill and the White House. It is very nonproductive, and the people in the country are getting tired of it.

Rather than lobbying grenades, if we really wanted to do something real, last night we brought a resolution to this floor to restate the parameters of the negotiations that are supposed to be taking place but are not. And we said it has to be under CBO scoring. I stood up and said, fine, but we could make this resolution better by expanding it to say, let us get the negotiations going and keep them going until there is a resolution and let us keep the Government operating while negotiations are going on in good faith.

Do Members know what happened? My colleagues in the majority objected to that addition to the resolution. They object to allowing us to bring the coalition budget to the floor, to talk about what is really a middle-of-the-road plan.

Let us decide where we are going to negotiate. If we are going to negotiate in S. 207 with the President, with the leaders of the House and Senate, then let them negotiate and let us stop bringing each offer to the floor to try to bash it and say what is wrong with that and criticize it. That is not the way you conduct negotiations. If you conducted negotiations that way out in the real world, you would never negotiate with anybody.

So if in fact we are going to conduct those negotiations, let us let them do their work but let us pass the resolution to help them. Let us try and find ways to come together with real solutions instead of just lobbying grenades back and forth.

I submit to my colleagues that, if we could bring the coalition budget to the floor along with all of the other budget alternatives, close the doors in this place and keep everybody in here until we come to a resolution, we could find agreement. It would be an agreement that would have bipartisan support, but that agreement would have to start from the middle of this body and move out, not from either opposite pole, and move toward the center.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 15 seconds.

I say to my good friend we have had the coalition budget on the floor. We have had the Republican alternative on the floor. The only alternative we cannot get on the floor is the President's, and that is why we have had to take his proposals, even though it is not a budget, put it in the form of a budget, and bring it to the floor today.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Glenwood Springs, CO [Mr. MCINNIS], a very distinguished member of the Committee on Rules.

Mr. MCINNIS. Mr. Speaker, it is all very, very simple. The President made a deal, and the people of America expect the President to stick to his deal.

Granted, the President does not have a very good track record. I looked in the Wall Street Journal today and they have got an ad. Let me repeat what that ad says.

"Without a balanced budget, the party is over, no matter which party you are in. There are moments in history when a single choice can make the difference between vastly differing futures, one a bright future, the other a dark. We believe that you, the political leaders of this country, are now confronting such a choice in your deliberations over a plan to balance the Federal budget."

It comes back to a balanced budget. The President made that promise to the American people. All of us saw it. All of us rejoiced because this President said he would agree to a 7-year balanced budget, which surprised all of us, because, as you remember, he went to 5 to 9, 8, but he agreed in writing to a 7-year budget scored by the CBO.

Yesterday he put a bunch of children behind him, kind of as props and attacks everybody who is expecting him to keep his word.

It is very simple. Mr. President, keep your word to the American people. When you talk to those children, talk to them about Scout's honor, talk to them about the importance of keeping your word. That is what it all comes down to.

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. Mr. Speaker, the President is being maligned. That is against the rules of the House.

Mr. Speaker, I demand that those words be taken down.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will suspend. The clerk will report the words.

□ 1308

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. Mr. Speaker, I object to Mr. WALKER's contention to me. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER] just stated on the floor the gentleman has been maligned, so that is equivalent to the President.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Hawaii will suspend. No business is in order until the Clerk has reported the words.

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. If that is the case, Mr. Speaker, somebody should have taken down the words.

Mr. MCINNIS. Order in the House, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Hawaii will suspend.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, parliamentary inquiry. The gentleman should not be—

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The House must first deal with the matter before it.

Mr. WALKER. The gentleman should not be at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the words.

The Clerk read as follows:

Yesterday he puts a bunch of children behind him kind of as props and attacks everybody who is expecting him to keep his word. It is very simple. Mr. President, keep your word to the American people. When you talk to those children, talk to them about scout's honor, talk to them about the importance of keeping your word. That is what it all comes down to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, this is not an improper personal reference to the President.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRIES

Mr. VOLKMER. Mr. Speaker, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. VOLKMER. Were not those words just read a direct statement to the President of the United States? Read them again. That is not, under the rules of the House, permitted.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. That is not a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. Mr. Speaker, parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. VOLKMER. That was directed right at the President.

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. Mr. Speaker, parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. VOLKMER. Not to the Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Member should not directly address the President.

Mr. VOLKMER. They were, too. Read them.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. While the Chair will remind all Members to address the Speaker, not the President, the words were not a pejorative reference to the President.

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. Parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Hawaii will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. Did I understand you correctly, just before your last sentence, that you did indicate that the words taken down were not out of order, question No. 1; and, No. 2, question No. 2, did you make an admonition to the body not to make direct references to the President?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Members are to direct their remarks to the Chair, and not to the President, and the Chair did not declare that the remarks were otherwise out of order.

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. A parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker, is it in order to direct remarks from this floor to the President?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Members have been reminded that it is proper to direct their remarks to the Speaker and not to the President.

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. I thank the Chair very much.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. MCINNIS].

Mr. MCINNIS. Prior to the distraction, we got back to the key issue here, and the key issue is we have got to reach a balanced budget. That is what the American people expect, and that is what this Congress should deliver, and in a few moments, we are going to get an opportunity to vote on the proposal the President calls a balanced budget.

I would venture to say very few Republicans are going to support that, excuse me, very few Democrats are going to support that, because they know, as we know, that his proposal will not balance the budget.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER].

(Mr. MILLER of California asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, the reason we are here talking about a Republican proposal that they want to pretend is the President's budget is because what the Republicans do not want to talk about is their budget, because this may be the most unpopular budget in the history of this country because the American people have discovered over the last several months that the Republicans are set on a course which is to devastate the Medicare Program of this Nation, to remove that health care protection from our seniors, to devastate the Medicaid and abolish the Medicaid Program that provides health care to poor women and poor children of this Nation, to people who have lost their jobs, and that devastates the environment of this country by removing the environmental protections, and it devastates the education programs of this country by savaging the cuts and the support for education.

This is not the President's budget. But, again, the Republicans would rather talk about this than talk about what is in their budget. They do not want to talk about the fact that they have not kept the agreement with the President, that the budget that would come from that agreement would protect Medicare, would protect Medicaid, would protect education, and would protect the environment. They have not met that test.

So what did they do? They shut down the Government because they do not want to discuss the fact that they have failed the test to protect Medicare and Medicaid. They have not met that test.

What are they going to talk about today? They have decided they would try and talk about the President of the United States, as opposed to their budget.

They should not be let off the hook so cheaply. The fact of the matter is that not only do the Democrats reject this Republican budget, but overwhelming numbers of the American citizenry reject this budget. Why? Because they know now what it means to their families. They know what it means to the health security of their

parents and their grandparents. They know what it means to their family's health security should they lose their job.

It is the Republican budget that devastates those programs, and the Republicans do not want to talk about it.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. STENHOLM].

(Mr. STENHOLM asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Speaker, at first glance today I thought that this was not going to be a very helpful exercise, and with some of the tone, I think that was proven right.

But let us get back to taking a lemon and let us try to make some lemonade out of it. I am on the nonnegotiating team. We have spent the last 2 weeks plus trying to get to the table and discuss the policy differences, and we have been denied that day after day after day. We have been denied the opportunity to sit down and talk about the honest policy differences.

So I look at this as an opportunity. I ask every Member of this body to oppose the previous question. Oppose the previous question and let us spend the next 3 hours discussing the coalition budget under an open rule in which any Member of this body on either side of the House can sit down and talk about what we like and dislike about the policy that has been presented by the coalition. If we defeat this previous question, we can do that, and I say in the spirit of Christmas and fairness, instead of spending the next 3 hours debating a budget which really has never been presented, which will get no votes, and that is what it should, let us spend the next 3 hours dealing with policy differences where we have some agreement on both sides of the aisle and some disagreement.

You know, this budget agreement and why we have been unable to negotiate has been painful to me because I read and re-read the President has agreed to support a 7-year balanced budget CBO scored. What he has not agreed was to present this final offer in the beginning of the negotiating process.

What the President has argued for is let us have consultation and negotiation, and that is something that I sense because I have talked to enough friends on the Republican side of the aisle as well as my colleagues on the Democratic side of the aisle that we would love to get to doing. But the rule before us does not allow that. It is not helpful, and it is not constructive. It certainly is not in keeping with the Christmas spirit.

Let us defeat the previous question. If we defeat the previous question, we will put the coalition budget on the floor under an open rule, not a closed rule, and we can spend 3 hours of constructive discussions and see whether we might not be able to bridge some of the differences before us.

Our Government is shut down for no good reason. There is no good reason for us to have our employees out on the streets before Christmas. We cannot bring ourselves to sit down as intelligent men and women and discuss the policy differences when we have already agreed in the end there will be a balanced budget CBO scored, 7 years, that will, in fact, be passed and certified.

I ask the defeat of the previous question, and let us have a productive 3 hours of discussion.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLINGER], one of the most respected Members of this body, chairman of the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

Mr. CLINGER. Mr. Speaker, today we have before us Clinton IV—the President's fourth attempt this year to balance the Federal budget. Unfortunately, despite the rhetoric coming from the White House, this budget—like its three predecessors—never reaches balance.

When the President signed the last continuing resolution into law 30 days ago, he gave his word to Congress and the American people that he would work in good faith to balance the budget in 7 years using honest CBO numbers. However, since then, the White House has given very little indication that it truly wants a balanced budget.

The latest White House budget is evidence of the President's lack of commitment to balancing the budget because it once again relies on overly optimistic economic projections to balance the budget.

The Clinton administration has decided to cook the books and use accounting gimmicks to give the illusion of a balanced budget. But in reality, Clinton IV falls \$487 billion short of a balanced budget, leaving us with a deficit or \$87 billion in 2002.

Mr. Speaker, we all know there are only two ways to balance the budget. We can reduce outlays or increase revenues. In laymen's terms, that means we can either cut Federal spending or raise taxes.

Assuming the White House is working in good faith, it's my understanding the President can't find any more savings in the Federal budget beyond what is in Clinton IV.

Mr. Speaker, that's fine with me. I take the President at his word that he can't cut any more wasteful, unnecessary spending in the Federal Government's \$1.5 trillion annual budget.

I accept the fact that he can't find anymore budgetary savings by reducing the size of Government and making it more efficient.

And, I believe him and other White House officials when they say that this is the President's best attempt to balance the budget while protecting his priorities.

However, the fact still remains that the President's budget never reaches balance. And if he can't cut any more

spending, then he only has one other option—to raise taxes.

To me, this sounds an awful lot like the Clinton budget of 1993—the largest tax increase in U.S. history—the one the President said was a mistake just several weeks ago.

It appears the President wants to raise taxes \$487 billion to balance the budget in 7 years. If it is, it's time you square with the American people and admit that you can't find any more Government to cut and you'll have to raise their taxes, again.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to reject the newest, largest record-breaking tax increase in U.S. history.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. COLEMAN].

(Mr. COLEMAN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. COLEMAN. Mr. Speaker, I guess the question a lot of us had when we saw that this was on the calendar, what exactly or from what numbers are we working? I did not get a budget sent to my office like I got when the President first submitted his budget, nor did I get one when I saw the Republican budget like that. I retrieved from the desk of the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] there a copy.

I was wondering what happened in the transportation and related provisions section, as the ranking member on that particular subcommittee. I wonder if you might be able to give me some idea about what this balanced budget proposal by the administration did to the minimum allocation program.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLEMAN. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. SOLOMON. There is a 2-hour general debate coming up in which the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH] has the entire outline. We would be very glad to answer your question. The truth is that document you have there is \$87 billion out of balance in the year 2002.

Mr. COLEMAN. No, excuse me. Reclaiming my time, the gentleman from New York makes that claim. But he is on the Committee on Rules. Should we not wait for the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH] to tell us it is \$87 billion out of whack? I mean, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH] has all the knowledge in this arena, does he not? I understood that he, reclaiming my time, if the gentleman will permit me, I understood it was the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH] who knew best what, where to go, to look for dollars and exactly which numbers we should be using. My understanding of that is that we have all agreed CBO, most of us have agreed, CBO is the proper place to look.

Yet I am not sure that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH], who is putting his pencil to this, has an accurate number at all. Certainly, the Committee on

Rules does not. You are taking the word of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH] only. Is that correct?

Mr. SOLOMON. If the gentleman will yield further, I am taking the word of the Committee on the Budget. When you look at this document, again it is \$87 billion out of whack.

Mr. COLEMAN. Reclaiming my time, because I am going to run out of time, that is not true either, I say to the gentleman from New York. You are taking the word of the Committee on the Budget. This document right here, let me point out, reclaiming my time, Mr. Speaker, looking at this document, it says right on the top of it, and this is what is amazing about this waste of time under this rule, that we are all being put upon, "Prepared by the majority staff of the House Committee on the Budget." That means only the Republican staff prepared this. And that is what the reality of all of this is. This does not mean anything else but that.

Members, Members from the majority and the minority were probably not even party to this. Certainly not from the minority, not even the minority staff. I think that what you are asking us to do, I say to the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] is ridiculous.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 15 seconds. The gentleman failed to read the next line of the document before. It says, "Incorporating updated Congressional Budget Office estimates." That is what is here. The gentleman knows that.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. TAYLOR].

Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

I, along with the gentleman from Texas [Mr. STENHOLM], urge that we defeat the previous question, defeat the rule, bring the coalition budget to the floor under an open rule.

Folks, we have not had a President submit a balanced budget probably in my lifetime. President Reagan never came within \$100 billion. President Bush never came within \$200 billion. President Clinton has stayed more or less in that league, between \$200 billion and \$300 billion. This is nothing new, neither Democratic nor Republican.

There are folks out of work. It is a week before Christmas. We are 80 days behind on our schedule to submit a budget for next year, this year. Let us cut the nonsense out.

I know the President's budget is a nonstarter. You know it is a nonstarter.

So many of you who have come up to me privately in different places and said let us get the coalition budget on the floor, if you have some parts of it you think are too high, offer an amendment to cut it. If there are parts you think are too low, offer an amendment to increase it. Let us just come to the floor with some ground rules where we have to be at the end of the day, so we do not end up with a \$270 billion annual

operating deficit next year under the Republican budget, I say to the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON], or an \$80 billion-something budget deficit in 2002 under the President's budget.

Let us fix it. We are legislators. It is a week before Christmas, and people are wondering whether or not they are going to get paid. Veterans are wondering whether or not they are going to get their checks.

Let us act like human beings. Let us act like statesmen. Let us defeat the previous question. Let us bring the coalition budget to the floor under an open rule, and let us pass a budget that the people of the United States want us to do and will be proud of us for doing.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Mt. Holly, NJ [Mr. SAXTON], the vice chairman of our Joint Economic Committee.

□ 1330

Mr. SAXTON. Mr. Speaker, I would just say to my good friend from Mississippi, Mr. TAYLOR, who just explained that Presidents have not traditionally offered balanced budgets, that is what makes this Republican conference different. We offered and passed a balanced budget. Today we are here to look at the President's latest proposal. I rise in opposition to it because it will increase the national debt and it fails to provide tax incentives to create economic growth.

I believe the President's real objective is political. But sooner or later, the American people will realize that the President is not serious about a balanced budget and he is not serious about a middle-class tax cut either.

Look, economic growth is brought about through a good tax policy, and that is not a partisan issue. It is bipartisan. Jack Kennedy knew so in 1963 and he said so, and the Republicans in this House know it today as well.

Also, the President's latest budget proposals fail to balance the budget. In fact, this proposal will add \$1 trillion to the national debt. It is important that the American people know were the President is and it is important that he knows where the Congress is.

The excessive level of Federal spending is a serious drag on economic growth, and that is beyond question. According to a Joint Economic Committee study, which I will release soon, for every dollar of projected spending, the economy is reduced by 38 cents. In other words, for every \$100 billion in projected Federal spending growth, the economy will shrink by \$38 billion.

The Republican approach would reverse this process and for the first time in decades we have an opportunity to balance the budget, and it is not through this proposal.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. WATT].

Mr. WATT of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, this is not rocket science that is going on here; it is kind of like when you have done something that you do not want to talk about and you try to change the subject. That is exactly what my Republican colleagues are trying to do.

They have got a budget that an overwhelming majority of the American public does not like, and they do not want to talk about their budget. So they bring something to the floor that has no relevance to what is going on to all, and they try to change the subject. That is what this debate is all about. It is a waste of time.

Before I came to this body, I used to practice law, and I used to get so frustrated when we had domestic cases and the party with the money would say "I am not even going to support my children while we have got a debate going on, while we have got differences between the wife and the husband."

That is exactly what is happening in this body as we speak. We have got people out of work, the Government shut down, our children are starving, and the parties are saying "We don't care about it, because we have got a dispute going on." The people with the money, the majority party, has said we will not even give you a continuing resolution to feed the children of America while this dispute is going on, because we do not like you and we do not like your proposals.

Reject this rule and this resolution.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Hawaii [Mr. ABERCROMBIE].

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. Mr. Speaker, in asking that we reject this rule, I want to reiterate that the proposition before us has been prepared by the majority staff. It purports to utilize Congressional Budget Office projections, and perhaps something of what the President has proposed in one form or another. But I would submit to you, Mr. Speaker, that the real agenda here today is to do the following, in the guise of balancing the budget: To actually undermine and in fact to subvert Medicare and Medicaid and to see to it that a tax giveaway goes to the very wealthy people in this country, and ultimately to privatize Social Security.

That is the real agenda, I believe, behind the whole argument about the balanced budget, because this balanced budget is nothing but an illusion. As the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. TAYLOR] indicated previously, from a copy of a letter I have from the Congressional Budget Office in 1996, the deficit under the Republican budget proposal is \$260 billion. Reject the rule and the resolution.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BRYANT], an outstanding new Member.

Mr. BRYANT of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, about 30 days ago the President joined with Congress in

agreeing to balance the budget in 7 years, using good, real numbers, CBO numbers, and for the first 3 weeks or so of that 30 days, his team sat on the bench on their hands and did nothing in this.

In the last few days of this 30 days, before the Government shutdown, they came forward with something I thought was a budget. They said it was a budget, I understood it was a budget, but it was not scored by CBO numbers. I today understand that my colleagues on the other side are saying, "This is not a budget and we do not want anything to do with it, and instead let us bring forth the coalition budget."

The coalition budget was brought forth about 2 months ago and was voted on, and the Democrats voted on their own budget there. Sixty-eight people voted for it, and 128 of their own people rejected that budget. So now they are trying to distance themselves from the President's budget and go back to the coalition budget, which they rejected soundly last October. But the President's budget falls short \$87 billion at the year 2002.

Now the current position of the President and his people is "We don't think we can do it in 7 years, and we don't want to use CBO numbers." But, know what? The American people that sent me to Washington want us to balance the budget, they want us to do it this year, and they want us to do it with good numbers, not cookbook numbers.

The results of yesterday's vote in this House indicates that most Members in this House want it done that way; 351 people voted to do it with CBO numbers in 7 years. Only 40 people voted against it. I cannot imagine 40 people voting against it.

Yesterday, the stock market, as a result of the lack of confidence in this President to balance the budget, fell 100 points.

I simply would say to this Congress and to those in Washington that Santa Claus no longer drops down from the Rotunda; that the people that sent me to Washington last year, in November of 1994, want us to send a message that Santa Claus does not live in Washington anymore, he moved to the North Pole.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas [Ms. JACKSON-LEE].

(Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mr. COLEMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. COLEMAN. Mr. Speaker, I wanted to be sure, the last speaker in the well had his metaphors wrong. It was the Easter Bunny that was supposed to pass down. You all were supposed to pass the budget back in April.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, I thank the ranking member of the Committee

on Rules for helping me to understand what we are doing this afternoon. I have got a document here that my Republican friends say is somebody's budget. I do not know what it is. It has handwritten numbers. I think the American people should really know whether we are serious. They are handwritten numbers in a document they tell me is supposed to be the President's budget.

But I would ask the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MOAKLEY] if he would answer a question, because we need to be about the people's business. As the former chairman of this committee, if the Committee on Rules was presenting a real serious intent to balance the budget, would we put forward a budget that no one knows where it came from, with no opportunity for input, amendment, or offering of alternatives? Is that something that has likely happened to the gentleman's knowledge during the time of his tenure here.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, this is not the President's budget. It was put together by the Republican majority and brought out without the President's knowledge. He has not seen it. OMB has not seen it. If we are going to put out a bill to really attack the budget, we would have had one or two or three alternatives. This is not the way to do it.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, I thank the gentleman for his wisdom and as well his knowledge.

Let me suggest that with a budget that has nothing but handwritten numbers, no prior notice to this body this is not a budget. Let me tell you what we are really fighting about, a Republican budget that denies 5 million low income elderly access to Medicare, a Republican budget that denies 1.3 million people the Medicaid they need, a Republican budget that denies 3.8 million children the Medicaid they need. What we need to do is pass a clean continuing resolution to allow a real debate on protecting Medicare, Medicaid, the environment, and education along with a Balanced Budget.

We have not been sent here to be obstructionists to keep the Government's doors closed, to burden the people working in the Government to provide services to the American people. This is a falsehood. This is a document that has handwritten numbers on it. It is not realistic.

Let us pass a clean continuing resolution, open the Government, sit down at the table of negotiation and pass a budget that the Republicans were supposed to pass in April of this year that balance the budget while protecting Medicare, Medicaid, education, jobs, and the environment.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from

Delmar, CA, Mr. DUKE CUNNINGHAM, one of the people I admire most in this body, a former fighter pilot.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, everything that both sides are arguing about boils down to power. For 40 years the Democrats had the power to spend money out of the Federal Government, which improved their chances to get reelected. They are not handling being in the minority very well, and they are doing everything they can to get the power and the ability to spend money.

They do not want a balanced budget, because it limits their ability to get reelected. Let me give you two different ways. One, let us take a look at education. Two principles: One is the power in the Federal Government, the other is back to the people.

Let us look at the President's direct lending program. It cost \$1 billion more than sending it down to the private industries to do it. \$1 billion, and that does not even include what it costs to take the money back, because it takes seven years to find that out. But yet we turn it back to private enterprise and save \$1 billion.

We increase the amount of money going to education, but we cut out the Federal bureaucracy, the power orientation in Washington, DC. We increase Pell grants to the highest rates. We increase student loans by 50 percent. Yet the other side says you are destroying education. What we are destroying is your ability to disburse money down out of the Federal Government.

Let us look at Goals 2000. We only get about 23 cents out of every dollar back into education because of the bureaucracy. Logically, you would want to increase education by getting more money down to the people and to education. Goals 2000 at the Federal level, absolutely, we killed it out of the Federal level. We send the money back to the States. They do not have the rules, the regulations. That 7 percent of the Federal Government education budget requires over 50 percent of the rules and regulations, 75 percent of the paperwork. It is not effective to do it that way. But yet you still want the power, the power to disburse money, so you can get reelected, and that is wrong, and that is what this whole fight is about.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL], the former chairman.

(Mr. DINGELL asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, this is a political exercise. It does not have anything to do with dealing with the budget or the balancing of the budget. The proposal has never been read, it has never been exposed to the light of day. My Republican colleagues know as much about the Russian budget as they know about what is in this legislation. The bill is not going to be read, this bill is not going to be heard in any

committee, there is no opportunity to amend. There is not even a motion to recommit made available under this rule.

Mr. Speaker, this is a sorry charade. Only a scoundrel would say or a fool would say that this is a fair process, and only a fool would believe that this is a fair process. This is a mechanism simply to get my Republican colleagues off the hook because they have closed down the Federal Government.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

(Mr. MOAKLEY asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I submit the following material for the RECORD.

PREVIOUS QUESTION AMENDMENT TO HOUSE
RESOLUTION 309 TO CONSIDER THE COALITION
BUDGET UNDER AN OPEN RULE

At the end of the resolution, add the following:

Upon disposition of House Concurrent Resolution 122, the House shall immediately resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole to consider a concurrent resolution consisting of the text of the amendment in the na-

ture of a substitute numbered 1 and printed in the Congressional Record of May 16, 1995. General debate shall not exceed three hours, equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent thereto. After the conclusion of consideration of the concurrent resolution for amendment, the committee shall rise and report the concurrent resolution to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the concurrent resolution and amendments thereto to final adoption without intervening motion. The concurrent resolution shall not be subject to a demand for a division of the question of its adoption.

FLOOR PROCEDURE IN THE 104TH CONGRESS; COMPILED BY THE RULES COMMITTEE DEMOCRATS

Bill No.	Title	Resolution No.	Process used for floor consideration	Amendments in order
H.R. 1*	Compliance	H. Res. 6	Closed	None.
H. Res. 6	Opening Day Rules Package	H. Res. 5	Closed: contained a closed rule on H.R. 1 within the closed rule	None.
H.R. 5*	Unfunded Mandates	H. Res. 38	Restrictive: Motion adopted over Democratic objection in the Committee of the Whole to limit debate on section 4: Pre-printing gets preference.	N/A.
H.J. Res. 2*	Balanced Budget	H. Res. 44	Restrictive: only certain substitutes	2R; 4D.
H. Res. 43	Committee Hearings Scheduling	H. Res. 43 (OJ)	Restrictive: considered in House no amendments	N/A.
H.R. 2*	Line Item Veto	H. Res. 55	Open: Pre-printing gets preference	N/A.
H.R. 665*	Victim Restitution Act of 1995	H. Res. 61	Open: Pre-printing gets preference	N/A.
H.R. 666*	Exclusionary Rule Reform Act of 1995	H. Res. 60	Open: Pre-printing gets preference	N/A.
H.R. 667*	Violent Criminal Incarceration Act of 1995	H. Res. 63	Restrictive: 10 hr. Time Cap on amendments	N/A.
H.R. 668*	The Criminal Alien Deportation Improvement Act	H. Res. 69	Open: Pre-printing gets preference: Contains self-executing provision	N/A.
H.R. 728*	Local Government Law Enforcement Block Grants	H. Res. 79	Restrictive: 10 hr. Time Cap on amendments: Pre-printing gets preference	N/A.
H.R. 7*	National Security Revitalization Act	H. Res. 83	Restrictive: 10 hr. Time Cap on amendments: Pre-printing gets preference	N/A.
H.R. 729*	Death Penalty/Habeas	N/A	Restrictive: brought up under UC with a 6 hr. time cap on amendments	N/A.
S. 2	Senate Compliance	N/A	Closed: Put on Suspension Calendar over Democratic objection	None.
H.R. 831	To Permanently Extend the Health Insurance Deduction for the Self-Employed	H. Res. 88	Restrictive: makes in order only the Gibbons amendment; Waives all points of order: Contains self-executing provision.	1D.
H.R. 830*	The Paperwork Reduction Act	H. Res. 91	Open	N/A.
H.R. 889	Emergency Supplemental/Rescinding Certain Budget Authority	H. Res. 92	Restrictive: makes in order only the Obey substitute	1D.
H.R. 450*	Regulatory Moratorium	H. Res. 93	Restrictive: 10 hr. Time Cap on amendments: Pre-printing gets preference	N/A.
H.R. 1022*	Risk Assessment	H. Res. 96	Restrictive: 10 hr. Time Cap on amendments	N/A.
H.R. 926*	Regulatory Flexibility	H. Res. 100	Open	N/A.
H.R. 925*	Private Property Protection Act	H. Res. 101	Restrictive: 12 hr. time cap on amendments: Requires Members to pre-print their amendments in the Record prior to the bill's consideration for amendment, waives germaneness and budget act points of order as well as points of order concerning appropriating on a legislative bill against the committee substitute used as base text.	1D.
H.R. 1058*	Securities Litigation Reform Act	H. Res. 105	Restrictive: 8 hr. time cap on amendments: Pre-printing gets preference; Makes in order the Wyden amendment and waives germaneness against it.	1D.
H.R. 988*	The Attorney Accountability Act of 1995	H. Res. 104	Restrictive: 7 hr. time cap on amendments: Pre-printing gets preference	N/A.
H.R. 956*	Product Liability and Legal Reform Act	H. Res. 109	Restrictive: makes in order only 15 germane amendments and denies 64 germane amendments from being considered.	8D; 7R.
H.R. 1158	Making Emergency Supplemental Appropriations and Rescissions	H. Res. 115	Restrictive: Combines emergency H.R. 1158 & nonemergency 1159 and strikes the abortion provision; makes in order only pre-printed amendments that include offsets within the same chapter (deeper cuts in programs already cut); waives points of order against three amendments; waives cl 2 of rule XXI against the bill, cl 2, XXI and cl 7 of rule XVI against the substitute; waives cl 2(e) of rule XXI against the amendments in the Record; 10 hr time cap on amendments. 30 minutes debate on each amendment.	N/A.
H.J. Res. 73*	Term Limits	H. Res. 116	Restrictive: Makes in order only 4 amendments considered under a "Queen of the Hill" procedure and denies 21 germane amendments from being considered.	1D; 3R.
H.R. 4*	Welfare Reform	H. Res. 119	Restrictive: Makes in order only 31 perfecting amendments and two substitutes; Denies 130 germane amendments from being considered: The substitutes are to be considered under a "Queen of the Hill" procedure; All points of order are waived against the amendments.	5D; 26R.
H.R. 1271*	Family Privacy Act	H. Res. 125	Open	N/A.
H.R. 660*	Housing for Older Persons Act	H. Res. 126	Open	N/A.
H.R. 1215*	The Contract With America Tax Relief Act of 1995	H. Res. 129	Restrictive: Self Executes language that makes tax cuts contingent on the adoption of a balanced budget plan and strikes section 3006. Makes in order only one substitute. Waives all points of order against the bill, substitute made in order as original text and Gephardt substitute.	1D.
H.R. 483	Medicare Select Extension	H. Res. 130	Restrictive: waives cl 2(1)(6) of rule XI against the bill; makes H.R. 1391 in order as original text; makes in order only the Dingell substitute; allows Commerce Committee to file a report on the bill at any time.	1D.
H.R. 655	Hydrogen Future Act	H. Res. 136	Open	N/A.
H.R. 1361	Coast Guard Authorization	H. Res. 139	Open: waives sections 302(f) and 308(a) of the Congressional Budget Act against the bill's consideration and the committee substitute; waives cl 5(a) of rule XXI against the committee substitute.	N/A.
H.R. 961	Clean Water Act	H. Res. 140	Open: pre-printing gets preference; waives sections 302(f) and 602(b) of the Budget Act against the bill's consideration; waives cl 7 of rule XVI, cl 5(a) of rule XXI and section 302(f) of the Budget Act against the committee substitute. Makes in order Shuster substitute as first order of business.	N/A.
H.R. 535	Corning National Fish Hatchery Conveyance Act	H. Res. 144	Open	N/A.
H.R. 584	Conveyance of the Fairport National Fish Hatchery to the State of Iowa	H. Res. 145	Open	N/A.
H.R. 614	Conveyance of the New London National Fish Hatchery Production Facility	H. Res. 146	Open	N/A.
H. Con. Res. 67	Budget Resolution	H. Res. 149	Restrictive: Makes in order 4 substitutes under regular order: Gephardt, Neumann/Solomon, Payne/Owens, President's Budget if printed in Record on 5/17/95; waives all points of order against substitutes and concurrent resolution; suspends application of Rule XLIX with respect to the resolution; self-executes Agriculture language.	3D; 1R.
H.R. 1561	American Overseas Interests Act of 1995	H. Res. 155	Restrictive: Requires amendments to be printed in the Record prior to their consideration: 10 hr. time cap; waives cl 2(1)(6) of rule XI against the bill's consideration; Also waives sections 302(f), 303(a), 308(a) and 402(a) against the bill's consideration and the committee amendment in order as original text; waives cl 5(a) of rule XXI against the amendment; amendment consideration is closed at 2:30 p.m. on May 25, 1995. Self-executes provision which removes section 2210 from the bill. This was done at the request of the Budget Committee.	N/A.
H.R. 1530	National Defense Authorization Act FY 1996	H. Res. 164	Restrictive: Makes in order only the amendments printed in the report; waives all points of order against the bill, substitute and amendments printed in the report. Gives the Chairman en bloc authority. Self-executes a provision which strikes section 807 of the bill; provides for an additional 30 min. of debate on Nunn-Lugar section; Allows Mr. Clinger to offer a modification of his amendment with the concurrence of Ms. Collins.	36R; 18D; 2 Bipartisan.
H.R. 1817	Military Construction Appropriations; FY 1996	H. Res. 167	Open: waives cl. 2 and cl. 6 of rule XXI against the bill: 1 hr. general debate; Uses House passed budget numbers as threshold for spending amounts pending passage of Budget.	N/A.
H.R. 1854	Legislative Branch Appropriations	H. Res. 169	Restrictive: Makes in order only 11 amendments; waives sections 302(f) and 308(a) of the Budget Act against the bill and cl. 2 and cl. 6 of rule XXI against the bill. All points of order are waived against the amendments.	5R; 4D; 2 Bipartisan.

FLOOR PROCEDURE IN THE 104TH CONGRESS; COMPILED BY THE RULES COMMITTEE DEMOCRATS—Continued

Bill No.	Title	Resolution No.	Process used for floor consideration	Amendments in order
H.R. 1868	Foreign Operations Appropriations	H. Res. 170	Open; waives cl. 2, cl. 5(b), and cl. 6 of rule XXI against the bill; makes in order the Gilman amendments as first order of business; waives all points of order against the amendments; if adopted they will be considered as original text; waives cl. 2 of rule XXI against the amendments printed in the report. Pre-printing gets priority (Hall) (Menendez) (Goss) (Smith, NJ).	N/A.
H.R. 1905	Energy & Water Appropriations	H. Res. 171	Open; waives cl. 2 and cl. 6 of rule XXI against the bill; makes in order the Shuster amendment as the first order of business; waives all points of order against the amendment; if adopted it will be considered as original text. Pre-printing gets priority.	N/A.
H.J. Res. 79	Constitutional Amendment to Permit Congress and States to Prohibit the Physical Desecration of the American Flag.	H. Res. 173	Closed; provides one hour of general debate and one motion to recommit with or without instructions; if there are instructions, the MO is debatable for 1 hr.	N/A.
H.R. 1944	Recissions Bill	H. Res. 175	Restrictive; Provides for consideration of the bill in the House; Permits the Chairman of the Appropriations Committee to offer one amendment which is unamendable; waives all points of order against the amendment.	N/A.
H.R. 1868 (2nd rule)	Foreign Operations Appropriations	H. Res. 177	Restrictive; Provides for further consideration of the bill; makes in order only the four amendments printed in the rules report (20 min. each). Waives all points of order against the amendments; Prohibits intervening motions in the Committee of the Whole; Provides for an automatic rise and report following the disposition of the amendments.	N/A.
H.R. 1977 "Rule Defeated"	Interior Appropriations	H. Res. 185	Open; waives sections 302(f) and 308(a) of the Budget Act and cl. 2 and cl. 6 of rule XXI; provides that the bill be read by title; waives all points of order against the Taubin amendment; self-executes Budget Committee amendment; waives cl. 2(e) of rule XXI against amendments to the bill; Pre-printing gets priority.	N/A.
H.R. 1977	Interior Appropriations	H. Res. 187	Open; waives sections 302(f), 306 and 308(a) of the Budget Act; waives clauses 2 and 6 of rule XXI against provisions in the bill; waives all points of order against the Taubin amendment; provides that the bill be read by title; self-executes Budget Committee amendment and makes NEA funding subject to House passed authorization; waives cl. 2(e) of rule XXI against the amendments to the bill; Pre-printing gets priority.	N/A.
H.R. 1976	Agriculture Appropriations	H. Res. 188	Open; waives clauses 2 and 6 of rule XXI against provisions in the bill; provides that the bill be read by title; Makes Skeen amendment first order of business, if adopted the amendment will be considered as base text (10 min.); Pre-printing gets priority.	N/A.
H.R. 1977 (3rd rule)	Interior Appropriations	H. Res. 189	Restrictive; provides for the further consideration of the bill; allows only amendments pre-printed before July 14th to be considered; limits motions to rise.	N/A.
H.R. 2020	Treasury Postal Appropriations	H. Res. 190	Open; waives cl. 2 and cl. 6 of rule XXI against provisions in the bill; provides the bill be read by title; Pre-printing gets priority.	N/A.
H.J. Res. 96	Disapproving MFN for China	H. Res. 193	Restrictive; provides for consideration in the House of H.R. 2058 (90 min.) And H.J. Res. 96 (1 hr). Waives certain provisions of the Trade Act.	N/A.
H.R. 2002	Transportation Appropriations	H. Res. 194	Open; waives cl. 3 of rule XIII and section 401 (a) of the CBA against consideration of the bill; waives cl. 6 and cl. 2 of rule XXI against provisions in the bill; Makes in order the Clinger/Solomon amendment waives all points of order against the amendment (Line Item Veto); provides the bill be read by title; Pre-printing gets priority. "RULE AMENDED".	N/A.
H.R. 70	Exports of Alaskan North Slope Oil	H. Res. 197	Open; Makes in order the Resources Committee amendment in the nature of a substitute as original text; Pre-printing gets priority; Provides a Senate hook-up with S. 395.	N/A.
H.R. 2076	Commerce, Justice Appropriations	H. Res. 198	Open; waives cl. 2 and cl. 6 of rule XXI against provisions in the bill; Pre-printing gets priority; provides the bill be read by title.	N/A.
H.R. 2099	VA/HUD Appropriations	H. Res. 201	Open; waives cl. 2 and cl. 6 of rule XXI against provisions in the bill; Provides that the amendment in part 1 of the report is the first business, if adopted it will be considered as base text (30 min.); waives all points of order against the Klug and Davis amendments; Pre-printing gets priority; Provides that the bill be read by title.	N/A.
S. 21	Termination of U.S. Arms Embargo on Bosnia	H. Res. 204	Restrictive; 3 hours of general debate; Makes in order an amendment to be offered by the Minority Leader or a designee (1 hr); If motion to recommit has instructions it can only be offered by the Minority Leader or a designee.	ID.
H.R. 2126	Defense Appropriations	H. Res. 205	Open; waives cl. 2(f)(6) of rule XI and section 306 of the Congressional Budget Act against consideration of the bill; waives cl. 2 and cl. 6 of rule XXI against provisions in the bill; self-executes a strike of sections 8021 and 8024 of the bill as requested by the Budget Committee; Pre-printing gets priority; Provides the bill be read by title.	N/A.
H.R. 1555	Communications Act of 1995	H. Res. 207	Restrictive; waives sec. 302(f) of the Budget Act against consideration of the bill; Makes in order the Commerce Committee amendment as original text and waives sec. 302(f) of the Budget Act and cl. 5(a) of rule XXI against the amendment; Makes in order the Bliely amendment (30 min.) as the first order of business; if adopted it will be original text; makes in order only the amendments printed in the report and waives all points of order against the amendments; provides a Senate hook-up with S. 652.	2R/3D/3 Bi-partisan.
H.R. 2127	Labor/HHS Appropriations Act	H. Res. 208	Open; Provides that the first order of business will be the managers amendments (10 min.), if adopted they will be considered as base text; waives cl. 2 and cl. 6 of rule XXI against provisions in the bill; waives all points of order against certain amendments printed in the report; Pre-printing gets priority; Provides the bill be read by title.	N/A.
H.R. 1594	Economically Targeted Investments	H. Res. 215	Open; 2 hr of gen. debate. makes in order the committee substitute as original text	N/A.
H.R. 1655	Intelligence Authorization	H. Res. 216	Restrictive; waives sections 302(f), 308(a) and 401(b) of the Budget Act. Makes in order the committee substitute as modified by Govt. Reform amend (striking sec. 505) and an amendment striking title VII. Cl. 7 of rule XVI and cl. 5(a) of rule XXI are waived against the substitute. Sections 302(f) and 401(b) of the CBA are also waived against the substitute. Amendments must also be pre-printed in the Congressional record.	N/A.
H.R. 1162	Deficit Reduction Lock Box	H. Res. 218	Open; waives cl. 7 of rule XVI against the committee substitute made in order as original text; Pre-printing gets priority.	N/A.
H.R. 1670	Federal Acquisition Reform Act of 1995	H. Res. 219	Open; waives sections 302(f) and 308(a) of the Budget Act against consideration of the bill; bill will be read by title; waives cl. 5(a) of rule XXI and section 302(f) of the Budget Act against the committee substitute. Pre-printing gets priority.	N/A.
H.R. 1617	To Consolidate and Reform Workforce Development and Literacy Programs Act (CAREERS).	H. Res. 222	Open; waives section 302(f) and 401(b) of the Budget Act against the substitute made in order as original text (H.R. 2332), cl. 5(a) of rule XXI is also waived against the substitute. provides for consideration of the managers amendment (10 min.) If adopted, it is considered as base text.	N/A.
H.R. 2274	National Highway System Designation Act of 1995	H. Res. 224	Open; waives section 302(f) of the Budget Act against consideration of the bill; Makes H.R. 2349 in order as original text; waives section 302(f) of the Budget Act against the substitute; provides for the consideration of a managers amendment (10 min.) If adopted, it is considered as base text; Pre-printing gets priority.	N/A.
H.R. 927	Cuban Liberty and Democratic Solidarity Act of 1995	H. Res. 225	Restrictive; waives cl. 2(L)(2)(B) of rule XI against consideration of the bill; makes in order H.R. 2347 as base text; waives cl. 7 of rule XVI against the substitute; Makes Hamilton amendment the first amendment to be considered (1 hr). Makes in order only amendments printed in the report.	2R/2D
H.R. 743	The Teamwork for Employees and managers Act of 1995	H. Res. 226	Open; waives cl. 2(f)(2)(b) of rule XI against consideration of the bill; makes in order the committee amendment as original text; Pre-printing gets priority.	N/A.
H.R. 1170	3-Judge Court for Certain Injunctions	H. Res. 227	Open; makes in order a committee amendment as original text; Pre-printing gets priority	N/A.
H.R. 1601	International Space Station Authorization Act of 1995	H. Res. 228	Open; makes in order a committee amendment as original text; pre-printing gets priority	N/A.
H.J. Res. 108	Making Continuing Appropriations for FY 1996	H. Res. 230	Closed; Provides for the immediate consideration of the CR; one motion to recommit which may have instructions only if offered by the Minority Leader or a designee.
H.R. 2405	Omnibus Civilian Science Authorization Act of 1995	H. Res. 234	Open; self-executes a provision striking section 304(b)(3) of the bill (Commerce Committee request); Pre-printing gets priority.	N/A.
H.R. 2259	To Disapprove Certain Sentencing Guideline Amendments	H. Res. 237	Restrictive; waives cl. 2(f)(2)(B) of rule XI against the bill's consideration; makes in order the text of the Senate bill S. 1254 as original text; Makes in order only a Conyers substitute; provides a senate hook-up after adoption.	1D
H.R. 2425	Medicare Preservation Act	H. Res. 238	Restrictive; waives all points of order against the bill's consideration; makes in order the text of H.R. 2485 as original text; waives all points of order against H.R. 2485; makes in order only an amendment offered by the Minority Leader or a designee; waives all points of order against the amendment; waives cl. 5(c) of rule XXI (% requirement on votes raising taxes).	1D
H.R. 2492	Legislative Branch Appropriations Bill	H. Res. 239	Restrictive; provides for consideration of the bill in the House	N/A.
H.R. 2491	7 Year Balanced Budget Reconciliation Social Security Earnings Test Reform.	H. Res. 245	Restrictive; makes in order H.R. 2517 as original text; waives all points of order against the bill; Makes in order only H.R. 2530 as an amendment only if offered by the Minority Leader or a designee; waives all points of order against the amendment; waives cl. 5(c) of rule XXI (% requirement on votes raising taxes).	1D
H. Con. Res. 109				
H.R. 1833	Partial Birth Abortion Ban Act of 1995	H. Res. 251	Closed	N/A.

FLOOR PROCEDURE IN THE 104TH CONGRESS; COMPILED BY THE RULES COMMITTEE DEMOCRATS—Continued

Bill No.	Title	Resolution No.	Process used for floor consideration	Amendments in order
H.R. 2546	D.C. Appropriations FY 1996	H. Res. 252	Restrictive; waives all points of order against the bill's consideration; Makes in order the Walsh amendment as the first order of business (10 min.); if adopted it is considered as base text; waives cl 2 and 6 of rule XXI against the bill; makes in order the Bonilla, Gunderson and Hostettler amendments (30 min.); waives all points of order against the amendments; debate on any further amendments is limited to 30 min. each.	N/A
H.J. Res. 115	Further Continuing Appropriations for FY 1996	H. Res. 257	Closed: Provides for the immediate consideration of the CR; one motion to recommit which may have instructions only if offered by the Minority Leader or a designee.	N/A
H.R. 2586	Temporary Increase in the Statutory Debt Limit	H. Res. 258	Restrictive; Provides for the immediate consideration of the CR; one motion to recommit which may have instructions only if offered by the Minority Leader or a designee; self-executes 4 amendments in the rule: Solomon, Medicare Coverage of Certain Anti-Cancer Drug Treatments, Habeas Corpus Reform, Chrysler (MI); makes in order the Walker amend (40 min.) on regulatory reform.	5R
H.R. 2539	ICC Termination	H. Res. 259	Open; waives section 302(f) and section 308(a)	
H.J. Res. 115	Further Continuing Appropriations for FY 1996	H. Res. 261	Closed: provides for the immediate consideration of a motion by the Majority Leader or his designees to dispose of the Senate amendments (1 hr).	N/A
H.R. 2586	Temporary Increase in the Statutory Limit on the Public Debt	H. Res. 262	Closed: provides for the immediate consideration of a motion by the Majority Leader or his designees to dispose of the Senate amendments (1 hr).	N/A
H. Res. 250	House Gift Rule Reform	H. Res. 268	Closed: provides for consideration of the bill in the House; 30 min. of debate; makes in order the Burton amendment and the Gingrich en bloc amendment (30 min. each); waives all points of order against the amendments; Gingrich is only in order if Burton fails or is not offered.	2R
H.R. 2564	Lobbying Disclosure Act of 1995	H. Res. 269	Open; waives cl. 2()(6) of rule XI against the bill's consideration; waives all points of order against the Istook and McIntosh amendments.	N/A
H.R. 2606	Prohibition on Funds for Bosnia Deployment	H. Res. 273	Restrictive; waives all points of order against the bill's consideration; provides one motion to amend if offered by the Minority Leader or designee (1 hr non-amendable); motion to recommit which may have instructions only if offered by Minority Leader or his designee; if Minority Leader motion is not offered debate time will be extended by 1 hr.	N/A
H.R. 1788	Amtrak Reform and Privatization Act of 1995	H. Res. 289	Open; waives all points of order against the bill's consideration; makes in order the Transportation substitute modified by the amend in the report; Bill read by title; waives all points of order against the substitute; makes in order a managers amend as the first order of business, if adopted it is considered base text (10 min.); waives all points of order against the amendment; Pre-printing gets priority.	N/A
H.R. 1350	Maritime Security Act of 1995	H. Res. 287	Open; makes in order the committee substitute as original text; makes in order a managers amendment which if adopted is considered as original text (20 min.) unamendable; pre-printing gets priority.	N/A
H.R. 2621	To Protect Federal Trust Funds	H. Res. 293	Closed: provides for the adoption of the Ways & Means amendment printed in the report. 1 hr of general debate.	N/A
H.R. 1745	Utah Public Lands Management Act of 1995	H. Res. 303	Open; waives cl 2()(6) of rule XI and sections 302(f) and 311(a) of the Budget Act against the bill's consideration. Makes in order the Resources substitute as base text and waives cl 7 of rule XVI and sections 302(f) and 308(a) of the Budget Act; makes in order a managers' amend as the first order of business, if adopted it is considered base text (10 min).	N/A
H. Res. 304	Providing for Debate and Consideration of Three Measures Relating to U.S. Troop Deployments in Bosnia.	N/A	Closed: makes in order three resolutions: H.R. 2770 (Dornan), H. Res. 302 (Buyer), and H. Res. 306 (Gephardt); 1 hour of debate on each.	1D; 2R
H. Res. 309	Revised Budget Resolution	H. Res. 309	Closed: provides 2 hours of general debate in the House	N/A

* Contract Bills, 67% restrictive; 33% open. ** All legislation, 56% restrictive; 44% open. *** Restrictive rules are those which limit the number of amendments which can be offered, and include so called modified open and modified closed rules as well as completely closed rules and rules providing for consideration in the House as opposed to the Committee of the Whole. This definition of restrictive rule is taken from the Republican chart of resolutions reported from the Rules Committee in the 103rd Congress. **** Not included in this chart are three bills which should have been placed on the Suspension Calendar. H.R. 101, H.R. 400, H.R. 440.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote against the previous question so that we may bring an alternative rule to the floor. The rule would make in order the coalition budget proposal under an open rule as well as any other substitute budget that Members may wish to offer.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New York is recognized for 1 minute and 15 seconds.

□ 1345

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Why are we here today with the President's budget? Let me just read a quote from today's newspaper.

White House press secretary Mike McCurry said Republicans would have to drop their insistence that we produce a 7-year balanced budget.

Ladies and gentlemen, that is why we are here. I just heard Members complain that the Washington Monument is closed today because the President vetoed a bill saying that we did not spend enough on it. He vetoed a bill yesterday that said we do not spend enough money on EPA.

How are we going to balance the budget? Look at this. Last year he gave us a 5-year projection of his spending budgets totaling another \$900 billion added to the deficit. This year he gave us one adding almost a trillion dollars. Ladies and gentlemen, this is

the most serious problem facing this country today. That is why we have already had the minority's coalition budget on the floor, we have already had the Republican majority budget on the floor, and now we want the President's. Let us have a vote on it, up or down.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BUNN of Oregon). The question is on ordering the previous question.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground a quorum is not present and make the point of order a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently, a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

Pursuant to provisions of clause 5, rule XV, the Chair announces he will reduce to a minimum of 5 minutes the period of time within which a vote by electronic device, if ordered, will be taken on the question of the passage of the resolution.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 230, nays 188, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 867]

YEAS—230

Allard	Creameans	Hastings (WA)
Archer	Cubin	Hayes
Armey	Cunningham	Hayworth
Bachus	Davis	Hefley
Baker (CA)	Deal	Heineman
Baker (LA)	DeLay	Herger
Ballenger	Diaz-Balart	Hilleary
Barr	Dickey	Hobson
Barrett (NE)	Doolittle	Hoekstra
Bartlett	Dornan	Hoke
Barton	Dreier	Horn
Bass	Duncan	Hostettler
Bateman	Dunn	Houghton
Bereuter	Ehlers	Hunter
Bilbray	Ehrlich	Hutchinson
Billakis	Emerson	Hyde
Bliley	English	Inglis
Blute	Ensign	Istook
Boehlert	Everett	Johnson (CT)
Boehner	Ewing	Johnson, Sam
Bonilla	Fawell	Jones
Bono	Fields (TX)	Kasich
Brownback	Flanagan	Kelly
Bryant (TN)	Foley	Kim
Bunn	Forbes	King
Bunning	Fowler	Kingston
Burr	Fox	Klug
Burton	Franks (CT)	Knollenberg
Buyer	Franks (NJ)	Kolbe
Callahan	Frelinghuysen	LaHood
Calvert	Frisa	Largent
Camp	Funderburk	Latham
Campbell	Galleghy	LaTourette
Canady	Ganske	Laughlin
Castle	Gekas	Lazio
Chabot	Gilchrest	Leach
Chambliss	Gillmor	Lewis (CA)
Chenoweth	Gilman	Lewis (KY)
Christensen	Goodlatte	Lightfoot
Chrysler	Goodling	Linder
Coble	Goss	Livingston
Coburn	Graham	LoBiondo
Collins (GA)	Greenwood	Longley
Combest	Gunderson	Lucas
Cooley	Gutknecht	Manzullo
Cox	Hancock	Martini
Crane	Hansen	McCollum
Crapo	Hastert	McCrery

McDade Radanovich Stearns
McHugh Ramstad Stockman
McInnis Regula Stump
McIntosh Riggs Talent
McKeon Roberts Tate
Metcalf Rogers Tauzin
Meyers Rohrabacher Taylor (NC)
Mica Roth Thomas
Miller (FL) Roukema Thornberry
Molinari Royce Tiahrt
Moorhead Salmon Torkildsen
Morella Sanford Upton
Myers Saxton Vucanovich
Myrick Schaefer Waldholtz
Nethercutt Schiff Walker
Neumann Seastrand Walsh
Ney Sensenbrenner Wamp
Norwood Shadegg Watts (OK)
Nussle Shaw Weldon (FL)
Oxley Shays Weldon (PA)
Packard Shuster Weller
Parker Skeen White
Paxon Smith (MI) Whitfield
Petri Smith (NJ) Wicker
Pombo Smith (TX) Wolf
Porter Smith (WA) Young (FL)
Portman Solomon Zeliff
Quillen Souder Zimmer
Quinn Spence

NAYS—188

Abercrombie Gibbons Obey
Ackerman Gonzalez Oliver
Andrews Gordon Ortiz
Baesler Green Orton
Baldacci Gutierrez Owens
Barcia Hall (OH) Pallone
Barrett (WI) Hall (TX) Pastor
Becerra Hamilton Payne (NJ)
Beilenson Harman Payne (VA)
Bentsen Hastings (FL) Pelosi
Bevill Hefner Peterson (FL)
Bishop Hilliard Peterson (MN)
Bonior Hinchey Pickett
Borski Holden Pomeroy
Boucher Hoyer Poshard
Brewster Jackson (IL) Rahall
Browder Jackson-Lee Rangel
Brown (CA) (TX) Reed
Brown (FL) Jacobs Richardson
Brown (OH) Jefferson Rivers
Bryant (TX) Johnson (SD) Roemer
Cardin Johnson, E. B. Rose
Clay Johnston Roybal-Allard
Clayton Kanjorski Sabo
Clement Kennedy (MA) Sanders
Clyburn Kennedy (RI) Sawyer
Coleman Kennelly Schroeder
Collins (IL) Kildee Schumer
Collins (MI) Kleczka Scott
Condit Klink Serrano
Conyers LaFalce Sisisky
Costello Levin Skaggs
Coyne Lewis (GA) Skelton
Cramer Lincoln Slaughter
Danner Lipinski Spratt
DeFazio Lofgren Stark
DeLauro Lowey Stenholm
Dellums Luther Stokes
Deutsch Maloney Studts
Dicks Manton Stupak
Dingell Markey Tanner
Dixon Martinez Taylor (MS)
Doggett Mascara Thompson
Dooley Matsui Thornton
Doyle McCarthy Thurman
Durbin McDermott Torres
Engel McHale Torricelli
Eshoo McKinney Towns
Evans McNulty Traficant
Farr Meehan Velazquez
Fattah Meek Vento
Fazio Menendez Visclosky
Fields (LA) Miller (CA) Volkmer
Filner Minge Ward
Flake Mink Waters
Foglietta Moakley Watt (NC)
Ford Mollohan Williams
Frank (MA) Montgomery Wilson
Frost Moran Wise
Furse Murtha Woolsey
Gejdenson Nadler Wyden
Gephardt Neal Wynn
Geren Oberstar Yates

NOT VOTING—15

Berman de la Garza Lantos
Chapman Edwards Mfume
Clinger Kaptur Pryce

Ros-Lehtinen Scarborough Waxman
Rush Tejeda Young (AK)

□ 1405

Mr. SERRANO changed his vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Mr. HAYES and Mr. LEWIS of California changed their votes from “nay” to “yea.”

So the previous question was ordered. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BUNN of Oregon). The question is the resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 229, noes 189, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 868]

AYES—229

Allard Ensign Laughlin
Archer Everett Lazio
Armey Ewing Leach
Bachus Fawell Lewis (CA)
Baker (CA) Fields (TX) Lewis (KY)
Baker (LA) Flanagan Lightfoot
Ballenger Foley Linder
Barr Forbes Livingston
Barrett (NE) Fowler LoBiondo
Bartlett Fox Longley
Barton Franks (CT) Lucas
Bass Franks (NJ) Manzullo
Bateman Frelinghuysen Martini
Bereuter Frisa McCollum
Bilbray Funderburk McCreery
Bilirakis Gallegly McDade
Bliley Ganske McHugh
Blute Gekas McInnis
Boehrlert Gilchrist McIntosh
Boehner Gillmor McKeon
Bonilla Gilman Metcalf
Bono Goodlatte Meyers
Brownback Goodling Mica
Bryant (TN) Goss Miller (FL)
Bunn Graham Molinari
Bunning Greenwood Moorhead
Burr Gunderson Morella
Burton Gutknecht Myers
Buyer Hancock Myrick
Callahan Hansen Nethercutt
Calvert Hastert Neumann
Camp Hastings (WA) Ney
Campbell Hayes Norwood
Canady Hayworth Nussle
Castle Hefley Oxley
Chabot Heineman Packard
Chambliss Herger Parker
Chenoweth Hilleary Paxon
Christensen Hobson Petri
Chrysler Hoekstra Pombo
Coble Hoke Porter
Coburn Horn Portman
Collins (GA) Hostettler Quillen
Combest Houghton Quinn
Cooley Hunter Radanovich
Cox Hutchinson Ramstad
Crane Hyde Regula
Crapo Inglis Riggs
Creameans Istook Roberts
Cubin Johnson (CT) Rogers
Cunningham Johnson, Sam Rohrabacher
Deal Jones Roth
DeLay Kasich Roukema
Diaz-Balart Kelly Royce
Dickey Kim Salmon
Doolittle King Sanford
Dornan Kingston Saxton
Dreier Klug Schaefer
Duncan Knollenberg Schiff
Dunn Kolbe Seastrand
Ehlers LaHood Sensenbrenner
Ehrlich Largent Shadegg
Emerson Latham Shaw
English LaTourette Shays

Shuster
Skeen
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Solomon
Souder
Spence
Stearns
Stockman
Stump
Talent
Tate
Tauzin
Taylor (NC)
Thomas
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Torkildsen
Upton
Vucanovich
Waldholtz
Walker
Walsh
Wamp

NOES—189

Abercrombie Ackerman
Andrews Baesler
Baldacci Barcia
Barrett (WI) Becerra
Beilenson Bentsen
Bevill Bishop
Bonior Bonior
Borski Boucher
Brewster Browder
Brown (CA) Brown (FL)
Brown (OH) Bryant (TX)
Cardin
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Coleman
Collins (IL)
Collins (MI)
Condit
Conyers
Costello
Coyne
Cramer
Danner
DeFazio
DeLauro
Dellums
Deutsch
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Doggett
Dooley
Doyle
Durbin
Engel
Eshoo
Evans
Farr
Fattah
Fazio
Fields (LA)
Filner
Flake
Foglietta
Ford
Frank (MA)
Frost
Furse
Gejdenson
Gephardt
Geren
Gibbons
Gonzalez
Gordon
Green
Gutierrez
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hamilton
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Hefner
Hilliard
Hinchey
Holden
Hoyer
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee
(TX)
Jacobs
Jefferson
Johnson (SD)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnston
Kanjorski
Kennedy (MA)
Kennedy (RI)
Kennelly
Kildee
Kleczka
Klink
LaFalce
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lincoln
Lipinski
Lofgren
Lowey
Luther
Maloney
Manton
Markey
Martinez
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy
McDermott
McHale
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek
Menendez
Miller (CA)
Minge
Mink
Moakley
Mollohan
Montgomery
Moran
Murtha
Murtha
Nadler
Neal
Oberstar
Obey
Oliver
Ortiz
Orton
Owens
Pallone
Pastor
Payne (NJ)
Payne (VA)
Pelosi
Peterson (FL)
Peterson (MN)
Pickett
Pomeroy
Poshard
Rahall
Rangel
Reed
Richardson
Rivers
Roemer
Rose
Roybal-Allard
Sabo
Sanders
Sawyer
Schroeder
Schumer
Scott
Serrano
Sisisky
Skaggs
Skelton
Slaughter
Spratt
Stark
Stenholm
Stokes
Studds
Stupak
Tanner
Taylor (MS)
Thompson
Thornton
Thurman
Torres
Torricelli
Towns
Traficant
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Volkmer
Ward
Waters
Watt (NC)
Waxman
Williams
Wilson
Wise
Woolsey
Wyden
Wynn
Yates

NOT VOTING—15

Berman Edwards Ros-Lehtinen
Chapman Kaptur Rush
Clinger Lantos Scarborough
Davis Mfume Tejeda
de la Garza Pryce Young (AK)

□ 1416

The Clerk announced the following pair:

On this vote:

Ms. Ros-Lehtinen for, with Mr. Edwards against.

Mr. WALSH and Mr. EWING changed their vote from “no” to “aye.”

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERMISSION TO FILE CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 1655, INTELLIGENCE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 1996

Mr. COMBEST. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the managers on the part of the House may have until midnight tonight to file the conference report on the bill (H.R. 1655) to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 1996 for intelligence and intelligence-related activities of the U.S. Government, the community management account, and the Central Intelligence Agency retirement and disability system, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BUNN of Oregon). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

REVISED BUDGET RESOLUTION REFLECTING THE PRESIDENT'S MOST RECENT PROPOSAL

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Speaker, Pursuant to House Resolution 309, I call up the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 122) setting forth the congressional budget for the U.S. Government for the fiscal years 1996, 1997, 1998, 1999, 2000, 2001, and 2002, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The text of House Concurrent Resolution 122 is as follows:

H. CON. RES. 122

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring).

SECTION 1. CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 1996.

That the Congress determines and declares that the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 1996 is hereby revised and replaced and the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 1997 through 2002 are hereby set forth.

SEC. 2. RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND AMOUNTS.

The following budgetary levels are appropriate for the fiscal years 1996, 1997, 1998, 1999, 2000, 2001, and 2002:

(1) **FEDERAL REVENUES.**—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution:

(A) The recommended levels of Federal revenues are as follows:

Fiscal year 1996: \$1,039,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 1997: \$1,073,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 1998: \$1,114,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999: \$1,162,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000: \$1,214,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001: \$1,291,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002: \$1,354,000,000,000.

(B) The amounts by which the aggregate levels of Federal revenues should be changed are as follows:

Fiscal year 1996: —\$3,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 1997: —\$9,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 1998: —\$9,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999: —\$11,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000: —\$17,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001: \$3,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002: \$3,000,000,000.

(2) **NEW BUDGET AUTHORITY.**—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution, the ap-

propriate levels of total new budget authority are as follows:

Fiscal year 1996: \$1,282,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 1997: \$1,334,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 1998: \$1,399,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999: \$1,438,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000: \$1,493,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001: \$1,539,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002: \$1,569,000,000,000.

(3) **BUDGET OUTLAYS.**—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution, the appropriate levels of total budget outlays are as follows:

Fiscal year 1996: \$1,268,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 1997: \$1,329,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 1998: \$1,378,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999: \$1,426,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000: \$1,482,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001: \$1,525,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002: \$1,556,000,000,000.

(4) **DEFICITS.**—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution, the amounts of the deficits are as follows:

Fiscal year 1996: \$229,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 1997: \$261,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 1998: \$264,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999: \$264,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000: \$268,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001: \$234,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002: \$202,000,000,000.

(5) **PUBLIC DEBT.**—The appropriate levels of the public debt are as follows:

Fiscal year 1996: \$5,149,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 1997: \$5,423,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 1998: \$5,691,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999: \$5,954,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000: \$6,200,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001: \$6,474,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002: \$6,718,000,000,000.

SEC. 3. DEBT INCREASE.

The amounts of the increase in the public debt subject to limitation are as follows:

Fiscal year 1996: \$264,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 1997: \$274,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 1998: \$268,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999: \$263,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000: \$266,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001: \$254,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002: \$244,000,000,000.

SEC. 4. MAJOR FUNCTIONAL CATEGORIES.

The Congress determines and declares that the appropriate levels of new budget authority, budget outlays, new direct loan obligations, and new primary loan guarantee commitments for fiscal years 1996 through 2002 for each major functional category are:

(1) **National Defense (050):**

Fiscal year 1996:
(A) New budget authority, \$257,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$261,000,000,000.

Fiscal year 1997:
(A) New budget authority, \$253,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$256,000,000,000.

Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, \$259,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$254,000,000,000.

Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, \$266,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$259,000,000,000.

Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, \$276,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$268,000,000,000.

Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, \$286,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$275,000,000,000.

Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, \$286,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$280,000,000,000.

(2) **International Affairs (150):**

Fiscal year 1996:
(A) New budget authority, \$19,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$17,000,000,000.

Fiscal year 1997:
(A) New budget authority, \$17,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$17,000,000,000.

Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, \$16,000,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$17,000,000,000.

Fiscal year 1999:

(A) New budget authority, \$15,000,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$16,000,000,000.

Fiscal year 2000:

(A) New budget authority, \$17,000,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$16,000,000,000.

Fiscal year 2001:

(A) New budget authority, \$16,000,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$15,000,000,000.

Fiscal year 2002:

(A) New budget authority, \$16,000,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$15,000,000,000.

(3) **General Science, Space, and Technology (250):**

Fiscal year 1996:

(A) New budget authority, \$17,000,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$17,000,000,000.

Fiscal year 1997:

(A) New budget authority, \$17,000,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$17,000,000,000.

Fiscal year 1998:

(A) New budget authority, \$16,000,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$16,000,000,000.

Fiscal year 1999:

(A) New budget authority, \$16,000,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$16,000,000,000.

Fiscal year 2000:

(A) New budget authority, \$16,000,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$16,000,000,000.

Fiscal year 2001:

(A) New budget authority, \$16,000,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$16,000,000,000.

Fiscal year 2002:

(A) New budget authority, \$16,000,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$16,000,000,000.

(4) **Energy (270):**

Fiscal year 1996:

(A) New budget authority, \$5,000,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$4,000,000,000.

Fiscal year 1997:

(A) New budget authority, \$4,000,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$3,000,000,000.

Fiscal year 1998:

(A) New budget authority, \$4,000,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$3,000,000,000.

Fiscal year 1999:

(A) New budget authority, \$3,000,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$2,000,000,000.

Fiscal year 2000:

(A) New budget authority, \$3,000,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$2,000,000,000.

Fiscal year 2001:

(A) New budget authority, \$3,000,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$2,000,000,000.

Fiscal year 2002:

(A) New budget authority, \$3,000,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$2,000,000,000.

(5) **Natural Resources and Environment (300):**

Fiscal year 1996:

(A) New budget authority, \$22,000,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$22,000,000,000.

Fiscal year 1997:

(A) New budget authority, \$21,000,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$22,000,000,000.

Fiscal year 1998:

(A) New budget authority, \$20,000,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$21,000,000,000.

Fiscal year 1999:

(A) New budget authority, \$20,000,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$20,000,000,000.

Fiscal year 2000:

(A) New budget authority, \$19,000,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$19,000,000,000.

Fiscal year 2001:

(A) New budget authority, \$19,000,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$19,000,000,000.

Fiscal year 2002:

(A) New budget authority, \$19,000,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$19,000,000,000.

(6) **Agriculture (350):**

Fiscal year 1996:

(A) New budget authority, \$9,000,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$8,000,000,000.

Fiscal year 1997:

(A) New budget authority, \$11,000,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$10,000,000,000.

Fiscal year 1998:
 (A) New budget authority, \$14,000,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$13,000,000,000.
 Fiscal year 1999:
 (A) New budget authority, \$13,000,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$12,000,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2000:
 (A) New budget authority, \$13,000,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$12,000,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2001:
 (A) New budget authority, \$12,000,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$11,000,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2002:
 (A) New budget authority, \$12,000,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$11,000,000,000.
 (7) Commerce and Housing Credit (370):
 Fiscal year 1996:
 (A) New budget authority, \$4,000,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, —\$6,000,000,000.
 Fiscal year 1997:
 (A) New budget authority, \$3,000,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, —\$4,000,000,000.
 Fiscal year 1998:
 (A) New budget authority, \$3,000,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, —\$5,000,000,000.
 Fiscal year 1999:
 (A) New budget authority, \$2,000,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, —\$3,000,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2000:
 (A) New budget authority, \$4,000,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$0.
 Fiscal year 2001:
 (A) New budget authority, \$2,000,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, —\$1,000,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2002:
 (A) New budget authority, \$2,000,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, —\$1,000,000,000.
 (8) Transportation (400):
 Fiscal year 1996:
 (A) New budget authority, \$37,000,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$38,000,000,000.
 Fiscal year 1997:
 (A) New budget authority, \$39,000,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$38,000,000,000.
 Fiscal year 1998:
 (A) New budget authority, \$38,000,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$37,000,000,000.
 Fiscal year 1999:
 (A) New budget authority, \$35,000,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$38,000,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2000:
 (A) New budget authority, \$34,000,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$36,000,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2001:
 (A) New budget authority, \$34,000,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$36,000,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2002:
 (A) New budget authority, \$34,000,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$35,000,000,000.
 (9) Community and Regional Development (450):
 Fiscal year 1996:
 (A) New budget authority, \$10,000,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$10,000,000,000.
 Fiscal year 1997:
 (A) New budget authority, \$9,000,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$10,000,000,000.
 Fiscal year 1998:
 (A) New budget authority, \$9,000,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$9,000,000,000.
 Fiscal year 1999:
 (A) New budget authority, \$8,000,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$8,000,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2000:
 (A) New budget authority, \$8,000,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$8,000,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2001:
 (A) New budget authority, \$8,000,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$8,000,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2002:
 (A) New budget authority, \$8,000,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$8,000,000,000.
 (10) Education, Training, Employment, and Social Services (500):
 Fiscal year 1996:
 (A) New budget authority, \$59,000,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$55,000,000,000.
 Fiscal year 1997:

(A) New budget authority, \$60,000,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$59,000,000,000.
 Fiscal year 1998:
 (A) New budget authority, \$62,000,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$60,000,000,000.
 Fiscal year 1999:
 (A) New budget authority, \$63,000,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$62,000,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2000:
 (A) New budget authority, \$65,000,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$64,000,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2001:
 (A) New budget authority, \$66,000,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$64,000,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2002:
 (A) New budget authority, \$67,000,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$66,000,000,000.
 (11) Health (550):
 Fiscal year 1996:
 (A) New budget authority, \$124,000,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$123,000,000,000.
 Fiscal year 1997:
 (A) New budget authority, \$132,000,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$132,000,000,000.
 Fiscal year 1998:
 (A) New budget authority, \$142,000,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$142,000,000,000.
 Fiscal year 1999:
 (A) New budget authority, \$154,000,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$153,000,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2000:
 (A) New budget authority, \$167,000,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$166,000,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2001:
 (A) New budget authority, \$181,000,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$181,000,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2002:
 (A) New budget authority, \$197,000,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$197,000,000,000.
 (12) Medicare (570):
 Fiscal year 1996:
 (A) New budget authority, \$180,000,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$178,000,000,000.
 Fiscal year 1997:
 (A) New budget authority, \$196,000,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$195,000,000,000.
 Fiscal year 1998:
 (A) New budget authority, \$211,000,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$209,000,000,000.
 Fiscal year 1999:
 (A) New budget authority, \$226,000,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$224,000,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2000:
 (A) New budget authority, \$240,000,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$238,000,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2001:
 (A) New budget authority, \$258,000,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$256,000,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2002:
 (A) New budget authority, \$277,000,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$275,000,000,000.
 (13) Income Security (600):
 Fiscal year 1996:
 (A) New budget authority, \$216,000,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$219,000,000,000.
 Fiscal year 1997:
 (A) New budget authority, \$233,000,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$237,000,000,000.
 Fiscal year 1998:
 (A) New budget authority, \$252,000,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$246,000,000,000.
 Fiscal year 1999:
 (A) New budget authority, \$257,000,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$257,000,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2000:
 (A) New budget authority, \$267,000,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$268,000,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2001:
 (A) New budget authority, \$276,000,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$275,000,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2002:
 (A) New budget authority, \$286,000,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$283,000,000,000.
 (14) Social Security (650):
 Fiscal year 1996:
 (A) New budget authority, \$6,000,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$9,000,000,000.
 Fiscal year 1997:

(A) New budget authority, \$8,000,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$11,000,000,000.
 Fiscal year 1998:
 (A) New budget authority, \$9,000,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$12,000,000,000.
 Fiscal year 1999:
 (A) New budget authority, \$10,000,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$13,000,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2000:
 (A) New budget authority, \$10,000,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$13,000,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2001:
 (A) New budget authority, \$11,000,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$14,000,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2002:
 (A) New budget authority, \$12,000,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$15,000,000,000.
 (15) Veterans Benefits and Services (700):
 Fiscal year 1996:
 (A) New budget authority, \$39,000,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$37,000,000,000.
 Fiscal year 1997:
 (A) New budget authority, \$39,000,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$39,000,000,000.
 Fiscal year 1998:
 (A) New budget authority, \$39,000,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$39,000,000,000.
 Fiscal year 1999:
 (A) New budget authority, \$40,000,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$40,000,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2000:
 (A) New budget authority, \$40,000,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$42,000,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2001:
 (A) New budget authority, \$40,000,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$42,000,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2002:
 (A) New budget authority, \$42,000,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$43,000,000,000.
 (16) Administration of Justice (750):
 Fiscal year 1996:
 (A) New budget authority, \$22,000,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$20,000,000,000.
 Fiscal year 1997:
 (A) New budget authority, \$23,000,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$22,000,000,000.
 Fiscal year 1998:
 (A) New budget authority, \$24,000,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$23,000,000,000.
 Fiscal year 1999:
 (A) New budget authority, \$25,000,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$24,000,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2000:
 (A) New budget authority, \$25,000,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$25,000,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2001:
 (A) New budget authority, \$24,000,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$25,000,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2002:
 (A) New budget authority, \$22,000,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$23,000,000,000.
 (17) General Government (800):
 Fiscal year 1996:
 (A) New budget authority, \$14,000,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$14,000,000,000.
 Fiscal year 1997:
 (A) New budget authority, \$15,000,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$16,000,000,000.
 Fiscal year 1998:
 (A) New budget authority, \$15,000,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$16,000,000,000.
 Fiscal year 1999:
 (A) New budget authority, \$15,000,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$15,000,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2000:
 (A) New budget authority, \$15,000,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$15,000,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2001:
 (A) New budget authority, \$15,000,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$15,000,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2002:
 (A) New budget authority, \$16,000,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$15,000,000,000.
 (18) Net Interest (900):
 Fiscal year 1996:
 (A) New budget authority, \$279,000,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$279,000,000,000.
 Fiscal year 1997:

(A) New budget authority, \$291,000,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$291,000,000,000.
 Fiscal year 1998:
 (A) New budget authority, \$302,000,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$302,000,000,000.
 Fiscal year 1999:
 (A) New budget authority, \$309,000,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$309,000,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2000:
 (A) New budget authority, \$316,000,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$316,000,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2001:
 (A) New budget authority, \$320,000,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$320,000,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2002:
 (A) New budget authority, \$325,000,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$325,000,000,000.
 (19) Allowances (920):
 Fiscal year 1996:
 (A) New budget authority, —\$5,000,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, —\$5,000,000,000.
 Fiscal year 1997:
 (A) New budget authority, —\$6,000,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, —\$6,000,000,000.
 Fiscal year 1998:
 (A) New budget authority, —\$5,000,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, —\$5,000,000,000.
 Fiscal year 1999:
 (A) New budget authority, —\$6,000,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, —\$6,000,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2000:
 (A) New budget authority, —\$3,000,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, —\$3,000,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2001:
 (A) New budget authority, —\$7,000,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, —\$7,000,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2002:
 (A) New budget authority, —\$23,000,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, —\$23,000,000,000.
 (20) Undistributed Offsetting Receipts (950):
 Fiscal year 1996:
 (A) New budget authority, —\$32,000,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, —\$32,000,000,000.
 Fiscal year 1997:
 (A) New budget authority, —\$31,000,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, —\$31,000,000,000.
 Fiscal year 1998:
 (A) New budget authority, —\$31,000,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, —\$31,000,000,000.
 Fiscal year 1999:
 (A) New budget authority, —\$33,000,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, —\$33,000,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2000:
 (A) New budget authority, —\$39,000,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, —\$39,000,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2001:
 (A) New budget authority, —\$41,000,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, —\$41,000,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2002:
 (A) New budget authority, —\$48,000,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, —\$48,000,000,000.

SEC. 5. RECONCILIATION INSTRUCTIONS.

Upon the adoption of this resolution, the chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the House of Representatives and the chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate, after consultation with the ranking minority member of such committee, shall each file reconciliation directives in the Congressional Record to effectuate the provisions and requirements of this resolution. For all purposes of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, those reconciliation directives shall be deemed to be reconciliation directives set forth in this revised concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 1996.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. EMERSON). Pursuant to House Resolution 309, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH] and the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. SABO] each will be recognized for 1 hour.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH].

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michi-

gan [Mr. HOEKSTRA], a member of the Committee on the Budget.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Ohio for yielding time to me.

Twenty-eight days ago, this Congress reached an historic agreement with the President, really a contract, submit a plan to balance the budget, a plan that would balance the budget within 7 years, a plan that would balance the budget using Congressional Budget Office numbers.

Over the next 2 hours, you will hear a lot of debate and discussion on the President's plan. We will then have a referendum. We will have a vote on the President's best effort to balance the budget, an effort which disappointingly still has at least a \$75 billion deficit in the year 2002.

The President's plan does not reach balance. We will have to decide as a Congress whether this plan is good enough, whether this plan is good enough for this Congress at this time. But more importantly, we will have to decide whether this plan is a plan that is good enough for our kids. Is it good enough for the next generation?

I do not think this plan meets that test. This House can do better. This House must do better. We must do significantly better than the President's plan.

I think over the last 28 to 30 days it has become increasingly clear that, as we wage this historic battle, this House of Representatives must take the lead in restoring fiscal sanity to this country. This is an historic battle. This House has to lead this effort. The vote will happen in 2 hours. Vote no on the President's plan, and let us continue working on a real plan that reaches balance.

Mr. SABO. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Missouri [Mr. GEPHARDT], the minority leader.

(Mr. GEPHARDT asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in deep disappointment with the Republican Members of this House.

It's bad enough that they are pushing a budget plan that slices deeply into Medicare and Medicaid to shower tax breaks on the wealthiest Americans.

It's bad enough that they won't accept the President's constitutional obligation to veto their extremist budget—and actually shut down the Government twice to try to keep it on the table.

Now the Republicans want to waste 3 hours of the precious time in which we should be negotiating, by forcing a vote on a phony budget which even the Republicans admit is a sham.

I suppose the Republican leadership thinks this is good politics. But let's face it: It's lousy Government.

This pointless, vote has absolutely nothing to do with the real work of this Congress: reopening the Government with no threats or conditions;

and then finding budget solutions, not just budget soundbites.

This vote does nothing to end the Republicans' Government shutdown, which has denied millions of Americans the services they depend on—the services they pay for.

This vote does nothing to balance the budget in 7 years—or in any number of years.

In fact, this vote amounts to little more than a posture and a press release—a cynical attempt to play politics instead of rolling up our sleeves and getting down to work.

Well, let me say this:

America doesn't want deep Medicare cuts that will double seniors' premiums and force them to give up their doctors—all to give wealthy investors another tax windfall.

America doesn't want to slash child health, child nutrition, and school lunches to stuff the stockings of the most affluent Americans.

You never told them that was your agenda when they voted for you in last November's elections. In fact, when they find out what's really going on, hard-working families are overwhelmingly opposed to the Republican agenda.

And I hate to be the one to tell you this, but nowhere in the United States Constitution does it say that the Congress gets to shut down the Government if it does not like the President's veto, and doesn't feel like compromising even 1 inch.

You see, that seems to be the Speaker's belief. He said in yesterday's Wall Street Journal, and I quote, he "had to find a trump to match—the President's veto." So while the Republicans are busy rewriting the Constitution and inventing partisan card games—children, seniors, and whole families are falling on the chopping block.

You see, almost 1 month ago, the Republicans in this House made a pledge to protect Medicare, Medicaid, education, and the environment. Since then, they have failed that test—every day and in every way.

So let us stop trying to change the subject. Let us stop these hollow political gestures.

Let us start to work together, across party lines—not just to play accountant, and balance the budget at any cost and in any way—

But to balance the budget in a way that also balances our priorities.

Frankly, if the Republicans can not do that—if it's more important to them to stall and showboat—then it's not Republicans or Democrats who lose—it's all of America.

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the very distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HOKE].

Mr. HOKE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for yielding time to me.

Mr. Speaker, the previous gentleman, the minority leader, as well as the other gentleman from Missouri suggested that this is a show, this vote is a show. The problem is not that this

vote is a show. The problem is that the President has been a no-show. The President made an agreement 29 days ago that he would in good faith negotiate a balanced budget based on honest numbers by the year 2002. But the President has been a complete no-show.

So I applaud our chairman, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH], who has rendered into reality the ideas that the President has talked about and has forced the President into a budget which actually shows what he would have. If the President does not like it, if the Democrats do not like it, then let them say where they do not like it and correct it, and let the President come to the table and negotiate with the only, the sole precondition that we have a balanced budget in 7 years with honest numbers.

□ 1430

Mr. SABO. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

(Mr. SABO asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. COLEMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. SABO. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. COLEMAN. Mr. Speaker, we were just told by the gentleman in the well, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HOKE]; he said to us that, if we did not like it, we could change it. I suppose he means change it here on the floor.

Let me ask the gentleman this question:

Was there a committee hearing on this proposal that we are to vote on today?

Mr. SABO. No.

Mr. COLEMAN. Mr. Speaker, how in the world, are we supposed to change it? By the way, it is a closed rule that the Republicans just passed, does not allow us to offer any amendments, so we cannot say how we would change it other than by giving up and trying to get a second or two and make a speech.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman and I know this is a political sham it is hollow, as the minority leader said, and it is not deserving of the attention of this House, nor is it deserving of the votes of the Members who represent constituents across this country, and I, for one, do not intend to vote for what is now being called a majority staff report, and that is all it is on the Committee on the Budget, the staff puts some notes together, and I am not going to vote for or against it. It is not worthy of my time.

Mr. SABO. Mr. Speaker, I reclaim my time.

Mr. Speaker and Members, I think it is sort of a sad day. We have important work to do in this Congress. We should be passing a continuing resolution to have the Government operating. Then people who have very large and fundamental disagreements should be at the table negotiating differences. We should be there negotiating over sub-

stance and dollars that involve the fundamental future of this country rather than engaging in gamemanship.

To my friends on the Republican side, Mr. Speaker, let me just say, Please watch your rhetoric as it relates to certain things. I hear all this description of honest numbers, real numbers. I don't know what they are, CBO doesn't know that they are. I would just remind my friends that from mid-summer to a couple of weeks ago those so-called and honest numbers changed by \$135 billion. They were called real and honest in mid-summer; \$135 billion later they are still real; and honest.

The reality is we are looking to the future, we are trying to look longer in to the future than we have ever looked before in a budget. We are looking 7 years rather than 5 years. We have trouble looking 5 years into the future. We make guesses based on certain assumptions, and we should have a little humility.

I happen not to disagree with my colleague's conclusion that we should use in the fundamental differences over CBO revenue numbers, where there is a \$57 billion difference in 2002, but I do not describe them as honest or unreal, but if we are going to seriously try and balance the budget and hope that it may actually work, we should use cautious numbers. That is what they are, the more cautious numbers, not the real numbers as if somebody else is using unreal or honest versus dishonest. That is not the case. There are legitimate, very small differences in economic assumptions than when you project over 7 years become substantial. If we were projecting 5 years, those differences would not be that great.

As a matter of fact, over the first 3 years amazingly the revenue number between OMB and CBO differs by a grant total of \$1 billion. But just as in the hope that what we do this year may actually work, I want to use cautious numbers. I also want to make sure that we structure a program on the spending side that may actually work rather than putting together crazy scenarios where the odds of success are very little. That relates in part to how we structure a tax cut.

Mr. Speaker, I look at their tax numbers, I disagree with them on the substance of capital gains tax cut for the most affluent in this country, but, if we are going to do it, do honestly.

I look at their numbers, and it costs \$9 billion in 2001, and then it gains money in 2002. Where did the money go? Then it is back up to \$9 billion in 2003. How amazingly it goes like this, dips in the year they are in balance, and goes up the year afterwards. Same as using the most optimistic revenue assumptions.

I look at their Medicaid Program. My State; I trust that better than the projections I get from various experts around here. Lo and behold, I discover that they expect in the first 2 years they are going to get more money than

if we did no change. But then at the end of the year 4 it falls off the table. I compare it to our coalition budget. First 3 to 4 years, about the same; year 2002, miraculously theirs costs \$2 billion less.

Unrealistic assumptions about what States with any great flexibility can do. I suspect a little politics. All of these Governors are going to get all their money to play with with no guarantee they provide health care to anyone. I think they will all either be re-elected to their second term in office or they will all be out of office before the real cuts occur that are going to force them either to take people off the health rolls or they increase their State and local taxes, and they do that throughout their budget.

So to the President I say, Be cautious on your revenue estimates. To the Republican majority I say, Be real in the way you structure the long-term funding of programs. Then may be we can succeed in the end.

But I have to tell my colleagues if I really want to balance the budget, have lower interest rates, which I think will happen, it is possible, but we are going to have to get pragmatic, we are going to have to depolarize things, and we are going to have to fundamentally conclude that borrowing lots of extra money to pay for a tax cut to start on the path to a balanced budget does not make much common sense.

Mr. HEFNER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABO. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. HEFNER. Mr. Speaker, I just want to ask one question I have asked several times. I was hoping the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH] would be here because I trust him to be a honorable man in, certainly, our friendship over the years, and I have asked this question time and time again. People have come to this well and talked about how there is no cuts in Medicare, and we have talked about how the cuts in Medicare will affect senior citizens, and I happen to be a senior citizen. We talked about how they are going to use the tax cuts from Medicare for a tax cut. I would ask the gentleman:

If CBO does not score the \$270 billion in reductions, or cuts, or whatever the gentleman wants to call it, in Medicare, unless they score them, we cannot have the \$240 billion tax cut; is that right?

Mr. SABO. Mr. Speaker, we have got to score enough cuts in Medicare and other programs to provide for a \$242 billion tax cut over 7 years, and the Medicare cut was 270, now it is 230-something.

Mr. HEFNER. But we have to have it scored by CBO.

Mr. SABO. Absolutely.

Mr. HEFNER. So if it is scored to make room for a tax cut, it is a cut in Medicare to make room for a tax cut, it is a cut in Medicare to make room for a tax cut. If it walks like a duck, it quacks like a duck, in all probability it

is a tax cut, and they are going to use Medicare to pay for it, and make no mistake about it, and it is not scare tactics. It is telling the senior citizens the truth, and that is what scares them.

Mr. SABO. The gentleman from North Carolina has good judgment.

Mr. HOBSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DELAY].

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this sad alternative to a real balanced budget.

The President agreed almost a month ago to balance the budget using honest numbers. Instead, he has offered us this budget, unbalanced and discredited.

This budget alternative has been discredited for two simple reasons. It does not balance. It will not get any support from an overwhelming bipartisan majority of this House.

First, the budget does not balance. It does not even come close to balancing. Even with a parade of smoke and mirrors that would make Houdini blush, the President's budget still remains \$87 billion short of balance.

Why is reaching balance so important? Because if we do not reach balance, we cannot get the balanced budget dividend.

The President wants his cake, and wants to eat it too. That may work in the White House, but it does not work in the real world.

To get interest rates down, to give middle-class families a break on car loans, on mortgage rates, on school loans, we need a balanced budget.

And if my colleagues do not believe me, look what happened yesterday on the stock market.

Second, this budget will not come close to receiving a majority vote in this House, and that opposition will be bipartisan. Members on both sides realize that the President's budget is a loser.

My question to the President is this: If you knew it was wildly unpopular, why did you put it on the table?

And that is the real reason why we are voting on this alternative. We have not been able to engage the President in honest discussions, so we are forced to show the American people where the administration has failed. And it has failed miserably.

So, I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to send the President another message:

Get serious on a real balanced budget. Keep your promise, keep your word, and work with the Congress to save America's future.

Balance the budget now.

Mr. SABO. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. PAYNE].

Mr. PAYNE of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, sometimes the answers to our problems are so obvious that we miss them entirely, and that is exactly what is happening right now in this debate.

With the budget developed by the Democratic coalition, we can break this impasse right now. We can give the American people the best Christmas present ever: A budget that is balanced fairly and equitably.

Our plan balances the budget in 7 years under CBO scoring, it reduces the deficit faster and deeper than the Republican plan, and it provides greater resources to programs vital to working Americans.

But let me use my time to focus for a moment just on Medicare.

The Coalition has developed a Medicare reform plan that meets the demand of the American people for fairness, and efficiency and reform. It assures the solvency of Medicare through the year 2014. It asks all participants in Medicare to share in protecting the program's future. It achieves private-sector innovations, including provider sponsored networks and private-sector managed care. It provides expanded coverage for preventive care. It avoids the deep cuts that threaten the future of rural hospitals in my district and other rural areas.

Our bill provides \$100 billion more for Medicaid than does the Republican Conference plan, and by doing so it insures health care coverage for our most vulnerable citizens and for our rural communities. This is why an increasing number of health providers are lining up behind the coalition's Medicare reforms.

Just last Thursday, the American Hospital Association issued a statement which said it is time for a bipartisan solution on the budget and on Medicare and Medicaid, and the coalition plan is a good framework. More than a dozen other leading organizations have joined the AHA in praising our budget's health care provisions.

NOTICE

Incomplete record of House proceedings. Except for concluding business which follows, today's House proceedings will be continued in the next issue of the Record.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. SCARBOROUGH (at the request of Mr. ARMEY) for today, on account of family matters.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN (at the request of Mr. ARMEY) for today, on account of a death in the family.

Mr. YATES of Florida (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) after 3 p.m. today, on account of personal business.

Mr. EDWARDS (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for today on account of the birth of his son.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. MILLER of California) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. OLIVER, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. MILLER of California, for 5 minutes, today.

Mrs. CLAYTON, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. POSHARD, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mrs. MORELLA) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mrs. MORELLA, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DICKEY, for 5 minutes, on December 21.

Mr. RIGGS, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. SHADEGG, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART, for 5 minutes each day, today and on December 20.

Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DUNCAN, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan, for 5 minutes each day, today and on December 20.

Mr. MICA, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. SAXTON, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. GOODLATTE, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. HORN, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. MCINNIS, for 5 minutes, on December 20.

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED

A joint resolution of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S.J. Res. 38. Joint resolution granting the consent of Congress to the Vermont-New Hampshire Interstate Public Water Supply Compact; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. THOMAS, from the Committee on House Oversight, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 395. An act to designate the United States courthouse and Federal building to be constructed at the southeastern corner of Liberty and South Virginia Streets in Reno, Nevada, as the "Bruce R. Thompson United States Courthouse and Federal Building."

H.R. 660. An act to amend the Fair Housing Act to modify the exemption from certain

familial status discrimination prohibitions granted to housing for older persons.

SENATE ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 369. An act to designate the Federal Courthouse in Decatur, Alabama, as the "Seybourn H. Lynne Federal Courthouse," and for other purposes.

S. 965. An act to designate the United States Courthouse for the Eastern District of Virginia in Alexandria, Virginia, as the "Albert V. Bryan United States Courthouse."

S. 1465. An act to extend au pair programs.

BILL PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. THOMAS, from the Committee on House Oversight reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 660. An act to amend the Fair Housing Act to modify the exemption from certain familial status discrimination prohibitions granted to housing for older persons.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. WELDON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 45 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, December 20, 1995, at 10 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1848. A letter from the Acting Director, Defense Security Assistance Agency, transmitting the Department of the Army's proposed lease of defense articles to Rwanda (Transmittal No. 05-96), pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2796a(a); to the Committee on International Relations.

1849. A letter from the Acting Director, Defense Security Assistance Agency, transmitting the Department of the Army's proposed lease of defense articles to Rwanda (Transmittal No. 08-96), pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2796a(a); to the Committee on International Relations.

1850. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a report to Congress on Brazil's status as an adherent to the Missile Technology Control Regime [MTCR], pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2797b-1; to the Committee on International Relations.

1851. A letter from the Executive Director, Committee for Purchase from People who are Blind or Severely Disabled, transmitting the annual report under the Federal Managers' Financial Integrity Act for fiscal year 1995, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 3512(c)(3); to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

1852. A letter from the Chairman, Consumer Product Safety Commission, transmitting a copy of the annual report in compliance with the Government in the Sunshine Act during the calendar year 1994, pur-

suant to 5 U.S.C. 552b(j); to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

1853. A letter from the Director, Office of Management and Budget, transmitting OMB's estimate of the amount of discretionary new budget authority and outlays for the current year, if any, and the budget year provided by House Joint Resolution 122 and H.R. 2126, pursuant to Public Law 101-508, section 13101(a) (104 Stat. 1388-578); to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

1854. A letter from the Commissioner of Social Security, Social Security Administration, transmitting the semiannual report on activities of the inspector general for the period April 1, 1995, through September 30, 1995, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. app. (Insp. Gen. Act) section 5(b); to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

[Omitted from the Record of December 18, 1995]

Mr. SHUSTER: Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure. H.R. 2689. A bill to designate the U.S. Courthouse located at 301 West Main Street in Benton, IL, as the "James L. Foreman United States Courthouse" (Rept. 104-410). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. SHUSTER: Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure. H.R. 2111. A bill to designate the Social Security Administration's Western Program Service Center located at 1221 Nevin Avenue, Richmond, CA, as the "Francis J. Hagel Building"; with amendments (Rept. 104-411). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. SHUSTER: Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure. H.R. 2061. A bill to designate the Federal building located at 1550 Dewey Avenue, Baker City, OR, as the "David J. Wheeler Federal Building" (Rept. 104-412). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. SHUSTER: Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure. H.R. 1718. A bill to designate the U.S. courthouse located at 197 South Main Street in Wilkes-Barre, PA, as the "Max Rosenn United States Courthouse" (Rept. 104-413). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. SHUSTER: Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure. H.R. 2481. A bill to designate the Federal Triangle project under construction at 14th Street and Pennsylvania Avenue, NW, in the District of Columbia, as the "Ronald Reagan Building and International Trade Center" (Rept. 104-414). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. SHUSTER: Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure. H.R. 2415. A bill to designate the U.S. Customs Administrative Building at the Ysleta/Zaragosa Port of Entry located at 797 South Ysleta in El Paso, TX, as the "Timothy C. McCahren Customs Administrative Building"; with amendments (Rept. 104-415). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. SHUSTER: Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure. H.R. 2504. A bill to designate the Federal Building located at the corner of Patton Avenue and Otis Street, and the U.S. courthouse located on Otis Street, in Asheville, NC, as the "Veatch-Baley Federal Complex" (Rept. 104-416). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. SHUSTER: Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure. H.R. 2547. A bill to designate the U.S. courthouse located at 800 Market Street in Knoxville, TN, as the

"Howard H. Baker, Jr. United States Courthouse" (Rept. 104-417). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. SHUSTER: Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure. H.R. 2556. A bill to redesignate the Federal building located at 345 Middlefield Road in Menlo Park, CA, and known as the Earth Sciences and Library Building, as the "Vincent E. McKelvey Federal Building" (Rept. 104-418). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. SHUSTER: Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure. S. 369. An act to redesignate the Federal Courthouse in Decatur, AL, as the "Seybourn H. Lynne Federal Courthouse", and for other purposes (Rept. 104-419). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. SHUSTER: Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure. S. 965. An act to redesignate the U.S. Courthouse for the Eastern District of Virginia in Alexandria, VA, as the "Albert V. Bryan United States Courthouse" (Rept. 104-420). Referred to the House Calendar.

[Submitted December 19, 1995]

Mr. QUILLEN: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 312. Resolution waiving points of order against the conference report to accompany the bill (H.R. 2539) to abolish the Interstate Commerce Commission, to amend subtitle IV of title 49, United States Code, to reform economic regulation of transportation, and for other purposes (Rept. 104-425). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. MCINNIS: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 313. Resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 558) to grant the consent of the Congress to the Texas Low-Level Radioactive Waste Disposal Compact (Rept. 104-426). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 5 of rule X and clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. GILMAN:

H.R. 2808. A bill to extend authorities under the Middle East Peace Facilitation Act of 1994 until March 31, 1996, and for other purposes; to the Committee on International Relations.

By Mr. UPTON (for himself and Mr. FARR):

H.R. 2809. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to eliminate the requirement that States pay unemployment compensation on the basis of services performed by election workers; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FILNER:

H.R. 2810. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide that cafeteria plans which provide for grandfathered 401(k) plans may also provide for contributions to section 457 plans; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FORBES:

H.R. 2811. A bill to designate the nature preserve located at the Naval Weapons Industrial Reserve Plant in Calverton, NY, and administered by the Department of the Navy as the "Otis G. Pike Preserve"; to the Committee on National Security.

By Mr. THORNBERRY:

H.R. 2812. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide that the rate of tax on liquefied natural gas shall be equivalent to the rate of tax on compressed natural gas; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. THOMAS:

H. Con. Res. 123. Concurrent resolution to provide for the provisional approval of regulations applicable to certain covered employing offices and covered employees and to be

issued by the Office of Compliance before January 23, 1996; to the Committee on House Oversight, and in addition to the Committee on Economic and Educational Opportunities, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

H. Res. 311. Resolution to provide for the provisional approval of regulations applicable to the House of Representatives and employees of the House of Representatives and to be issued by the Office of Compliance before January 23, 1996; to the Committee on House Oversight, and in addition to the Committee on Economic and Educational Opportunities, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BURTON of Indiana (for himself, Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky, Mr. STEARNS, Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, Mr. HAYWORTH, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. KINGSTON, Mr. HOSTETTLER, Mr. NEUMANN, Mr. HERGER, Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mr. SAM JOHNSON, Mr. ISTOOK, Mr. JONES, Mr. MYERS of Indiana, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. SOUDER, Mr. MCCOLLUM, Mr. CALLAHAN, and Mr. MOORHEAD):

H. Res. 314. Resolution to amend the Rules of the House of Representatives to discourage frivolous ethics complaints; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. LIGHTFOOT:

H. Res. 315. Resolution calling on the people of the United States to set a place at their tables during the 1995 holiday season as a reminder of the men and women of the United States serving their country in the peacekeeping efforts for Bosnia and Herzegovina; to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 676: Mr. TORRICELLI.
H.R. 739: Mr. JONES.
H.R. 789: Mr. MINGE.
H.R. 791: Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota.
H.R. 1050: Ms. BROWN of Florida.
H.R. 1129: Mr. EVERETT.
H.R. 1201: Mrs. LOWEY.
H.R. 1274: Mr. NADLER and Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota.
H.R. 1484: Mr. BRYANT of Texas.
H.R. 1514: Mr. BILBRAY, Mr. INGLIS of South Carolina, Mr. CLYBURN, Mrs. CLAYTON, and Mrs. CUBIN.
H.R. 1573: Mr. RIGGS.
H.R. 1684: Mr. MASCARA, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, and Ms. FURSE.
H.R. 1794: Mr. SMITH of New Jersey and Mr. CHRISTENSEN.
H.R. 1998: Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. STUMP, and Mr. CREMEANS.
H.R. 2026: Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas, Ms. MOLINARI, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. GEKAS, Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. HANSEN, Mr. CANADY, Mr. MONTGOMERY, Mr. JONES, Mr. HEINEMAN, Mr. MANZULLO, Mr. ROYCE, Mr. KING, Mr. SAXTON, Mr. ROTH, Mr. SCHAEFER, Mr. GILLMOR, Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, Mr. THORNBERRY, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, Mr. ROHRBACHER, Mr. BURR, Mrs. SEASTRAND, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. NORWOOD, Mr. DEAL of Georgia, Mr. FUNDERBURK, Mr. TIAHRT, Mr. BILBRAY, Mr. CAMP, Mr. CHRYSLER, Mr. THOMPSON, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. GUNDERSON, and Mr. COOLEY.
H.R. 2036: Mr. COMBEST.
H.R. 2089: Mr. LINDER and Mr. EWING.
H.R. 2200: Mr. ROGERS.
H.R. 2202: Mr. TALENT.
H.R. 2245: Mrs. CLAYTON.
H.R. 2265: Mr. BONILLA.
H.R. 2407: Mr. WAXMAN, Ms. SLAUGHTER, and Mr. SERRANO.
H.R. 2497: Mr. HUTCHINSON, Mr. MCINTOSH, Mr. CAMP, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. EHLERS, and Mr. LIVINGSTON.

H.R. 2500: Mr. STENHOLM and Mr. WHITFIELD.

H.R. 2580: Ms. SLAUGHTER.

H.R. 2599: Mr. HOEKSTRA.

H.R. 2602: Mr. SHAW, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. BILBRAY, and Mr. KING.

H.R. 2654: Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mrs. CLAYTON, and Mrs. MEEK of Florida.

H.R. 2664: Mr. ARCHER, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. SPRATT, and Mr. TORRES.

H.R. 2704: Mr. CLAY, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. MFUME, Mr. FRAZER, Mr. KLECZKA, Mr. JACKSON, Mr. SKELTON, and Miss COLLINS of Michigan.

H.R. 2740: Mr. DUNCAN.

H.R. 2745: Mrs. MEEK of Florida, Mr. TORRES, Mr. BERMAN, Ms. RIVERS, Mr. MARKEY, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. OWENS, Mr. BECERRA, Mr. WATTS of Oklahoma, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. SABO, Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. MEEHAN, and Mr. KLINK.

H.R. 2769: Mr. ENSIGN and Mr. BROWNBAC.

H.R. 2778: Mr. ROGERS, Mr. EWING, Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. SOUDER, Mrs. KELLY, Mr. HUTCHINSON, Mr. UNDERWOOD, Mr. KLECZKA, Mr. TATE, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. WATTS of Oklahoma, Mr. KOLBE, Mr. DOOLITTLE, and Mr. HAYES.

H.R. 2779: Mr. HANCOCK and Mr. COBLE.

H.R. 2785: Mr. CARDIN.

H.J. Res. 106: Mr. ANDREWS.

H.J. Res. 127: Mr. HASTINGS of Washington and Mr. LAHOOD.

H. Res. 282: Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. REED, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. TORRICELLI, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. DEUTSCH, Mr. PORTER, Mr. SERRANO, Ms. MCKINNEY, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. FOX, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. McNULTY, Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin, Mr. ZIMMER, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. GEJDENSON, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. GUNDERSON, Mr. JOHNSTON of Florida, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. JONES, Mr. RUSH, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts, Ms. FURSE, Mr. WARD, Mr. LIPINSKI, and Ms. SLAUGHTER.